DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 439 UD 013 921

AUTHOR	Holzman, Seymour; Boes, Shirley
TITLE	Compensatory Education: What Works to Help Disadvantaged Pupils. Education U.S.A. Special Report Series.
INSTITUTION	National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	67p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National School Public Relations Assoc., 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209 (Stock No. 411-13447, $4.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Compensatory Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Program Evaluation; *Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act; ESEA Title III Programs; ESEA Title I Programs; ESEA Title VII Programs; Follow Through Programs; Head Start; Indian Education Act; Right to Read Program

ABSTRACT

The contents of this report are organized in five parts, as follows. Part One, "Title I: The Cornerstone of Compensatory Education," is a discussion of Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10): its purpose, the scope of Title I programs, the selection of target areas, aid to nonpublic school children, the requirement of parent involvement by law, and comparability as a source of confusion. Part Two, "Eight Approaches to Compensatory Education," discusses Head Start, Follow Through, postsecondary Education programs, Title III E.S.E.A., Title VII E.S.E.A., Title I Special Migrant Programs, Indian Education Act, and the Right to Read program. Part Three, "What Works?" discusses the traits of successful programs, and describes exemplary programs which indicate some of the factors that contribute to success in children's achievement. These include five programs that were studied by American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California. Part Four, "Crystal-Ball Gazing," predicts the course and direction of future federal compensatory education efforts. Part Five, an "Appendix," lists 1973 Ed Fair Programs, National Advisory Council on Education of Disadvantaged Children recommendations for legislation on compensatory education, and 1973 recommendations from Title III Advisory Council. (JM)

ED 085439

EDUCATION U.S.A.
SPECIAL REPORT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N S P R A
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION: What Works To Help Disadvantaged Pupils

UD 013921

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This Is an Education U.S.A. Special Report

Education U.S.A. Special Reports probe in depth a single area of education in an attempt to meet the need for accurate, factual, current information by school administrators, boards of education, school community relations directors, other school staff, legislators and other interested citizens. The *Special Reports* have been filling this role in educational journalism since 1965. A list of other current *Special Reports* can be found on the inside back cover of this report.

Education U.S.A. Special Reports are published by the National School Public Relations Association. NSPRA also publishes *Education U.S.A.*, the independent weekly education newsletter founded in 1958.

The following organizations cooperate with NSPRA in the publication of *Education U.S.A.* and help to identify current issues for the *Education U.S.A. Special Reports:* The American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of School Librarians, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Boards of Education and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Compensatory Education: What Works To Help Disadvantaged Pupils was written by Seymour Holzman and Shirley Boes. It was developed by the *Education U.S.A. Special Report* staff: Shirley Boes, Managing Editor; Roy K. Wilson, Editorial Director. Production: Cynthia Menand, Manager; Joan Lenz, Alice Mansfield, Andrea Olinger, and Joyce Pullen.

Additional copies of *Compensatory Education: What Works To Help Disadvantaged Pupils* may be ordered from the National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209. All orders under $8 must be accompanied by payment. Orders over $8 must also be sent with payment unless submitted on an authorized purchase order from a school district, organization or institution. Billed orders will include shipping and handling charges. Single copy, $4.75. Stock #411-13447.

COPYRIGHT 1973 NATIONAL SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION

ED 085439

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

OVERVIEW

Despite a barrage of rhetoric to the contrary, numerous compensatory education programs for disadvantaged children in schools around the country are achieving their goals. Many program administrators and state officials highly praise compensatory education efforts, yet some critics have assailed all such efforts as failures. They say the federal government cannot solve all the problems of society by sinking money into efforts to reduce the multiple inequalities that can lead to educational deprivation.

The cornerstone of federal compensatory efforts to help educationally and economically deprived children--the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)--has racked up an ambiguous record in the eight years since its passage in 1965. In line with its legislative mandate "to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunity in the nation's elementary and secondary schools," ESEA (PL 89-10) has reached into every state and into virtually every school district. Sixty per cent of ESEA participants are white, but ESEA has also tackled the problems of racial and language minority group children, migrant children, American Indian children and nonpublic school children in urban, suburban and rural settings across the United States. More specifically, direct assistance reaches between 9 and 10 million children.

The federal effort has identified the need for compensation, but it has also raised many questions which are as yet unanswered: What is being compensated for? Who should benefit? Who should bear the cost? And, most importantly, does the money spent on such efforts yield worthwhile returns?

These were some of the questions facing Congress as ESEA expired on June 30, 1973. Three courses of action on ESEA are open to Congress: extinction, extension or compromise. The course recommended by the House General Education Subcommittee in mid-August 1973 would combine extension and compromise by consolidating some parts of ESEA. But the House and Senate committees must agree before a vote by Congress. The changes are also subject to Administration demands for a fiscal 1974 budget that holds the line or makes cuts if possible and its demands for consolidation and tightening of categorical aid programs.

Table of Contents

Title I: The Cornerstone of Compensatory Education 4
Eight Approaches to Compensatory Education 11
Head Start 11
Follow Through 15
Post Secondary 17
Title III, ESEA 19
Title VII, ESEA 21
Migrants 23
Indian 26
Right To Read 28
What Works? 29
Crystal-Ball Gazing 55
Appendix 57

Title I, ESEA, the largest of the federal compensatory efforts, has also caused the most controversy. Title I basically is directed at correcting an adverse impact which the poor are presumed to have on the ability of a local school district to support public education. According to the statutory language of ESEA, the distribution of Title I funds is based on economic criteria. Once a determination of the eligible attendance areas has been made (on the basis of economic criteria), an educational needs assessment is used to determine which children within the attendance area are educationally deprived, thus, in need of Title I services.

However, an attempt to reach all children who have educational needs immediately leads to the question of money. Although the basic Title I legislation has had the effect of authorizing larger amounts of money for Title I each year since 1966, the actual appropriation has been significantly less than the authorization. For instance, the appropriation for fiscal 1966 was $959 million; the authorization was $1.193 billion.

Current eligibility of local districts for Title I funds is determined by the number of children aged 5-17 in families with an annual income of less than $2,000 and children whose families have an annual income above $2,000 receiving Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Each state department of education must also base allocations of Title I funds within counties having more than one school district on the number of children in low-income categories, according to the best available information.

One critic of the use of the poverty formula in determing school eligibility, Rep. Albert Quie, R-Minn., says Title I funds often do not reach those children most in need. Quie contends that a "short-range" change in the way Title I funds are allocated to the states should be based on (1) the use of 1970 census data instead of 1960 figures, (2) a different "weighting system" for children counted under AFDC. In the long run, Quie proposes that funds be allocated by using a means of measuring "educational need" of children. (Although no national test has yet determined the extent of educational disadvantage, education officials generally say from 10 million to 12 million children are educationally disadvantaged, i.e., not performing at grade level.)

Quie says: "Although there is a high degree of correlation between poverty and educational deprivation, that is only half the story. There are also hundreds of thousands of children who do not fall within the strict definition of poverty and many more who are from low middle-income families who are in desperate need of educational assistance."

U.S. Comr. of Education John R. Ottina cleared up some of the mystery regarding the use of census figures in a March 1973 speech to the Education Writers Assn. He said the law has mandated for some years that 1970 census results should be used to modify the Title I distribution formula starting in 1973, but the necessary population and income data were not received from the Census Bureau until December 1972. Therefore, first use of the data will be made in 1974.

Ottina commented on another controversial topic--what compensatory education funds should be used for. He detailed the Administration's recommendations, as proposed in the Better Schools Act:

> The primary lesson we have learned is that the greatest service we can render disadvantaged children is to prepare them with the basic skills they will need to cope with the educational curriculum--that is, reading, writing and the manipulation of numbers.

The bulk of Title I funds have been spent on reading and math, according to the National Advisory Council on Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC). And, as Ottina himself said: "Where academic achievement has been the fixed focus of the compensatory education programs under Title I, results can be seen, not only in better scores, but in interested and gratified parents and in the children's sense of self-worth and attitude toward school."

A more complete exploration of the many facets of compensatory education--lessons learned and successes achieved--constitutes the bulk of the report. All indications are that the federal compensatory education effort will continue, probably with a sharper focus and consolidation of effort and with the benefit of eight years' experience. Although much has been learned, there is still a long way to go. This message was clearly stated to the President by his own advisory council on Title I, NACEDC, in its 1973 Annual Report:

> Title I is a first step on the road toward equal educational opportunity in America.... Much has been expected from it. In the eight years that Title I has been in existence great strides have been made toward the attainment of the goal. It has made possible improved educational attainment for many children who otherwise would not have had this opportunity. It has done much, but even more is expected of it. Equal educational opportunity is a goal that cannot be achieved in only eight years.

Compensatory education has other strong supporters in high places, as evidenced by the participants at a panel discussion on compensatory education at the 1973 Annual Meeting of the Education Commission of the States. Some of the views expressed by the participants follow:

- Even though ESEA has been the most ambitiously supported educational venture from the financial point of view, when the amount of money is held up against the enormity of the need, it is altogether inadequate.... We have to accept the obligation, through the school program, to make up for the child's environment or else we have accepted a defeatist attitude.--Robert Wheeler, U.S. associate commissioner of education

- If we expect commensurate learning effectiveness with each dollar put into compensatory education, we're doomed to disappointment. It isn't a one-to-one relationship. For each degree of advancement in teaching children who are difficult to educate, we are going to have to spend much more per pupil than we are now spending.--David Selden, president of the American Federation of Teachers

- In Michigan, compensatory education works because the responsibility for learning has been shifted from the student to the teacher; the responsibility for finding out "what works" has been shifted from the teacher to the school administration.--John W. Porter, Michigan state superintendent of public instruction

TITLE I: THE CORNERSTONE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the principal federal vehicle for aiding disadvantaged children; it is also the largest, the most talked about and fought over, the most complex to administer and evaluate and, say many critics, the most misunderstood.

Its purpose, as stated simply by Congress, is:

> To provide financial assistance to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Yet, almost every part of that definition causes controversy: Money has always been a problem (how much, who's to get it, how it's to be used). The chain of command in the administration of the program--from federal to state to local--frequently runs into snags.

The definition and narrowing of who's to receive the funds raised questions for many years of whether it was better to spend a small amount of money on a lot of children or to concentrate funds on a smaller number of children with the most critical needs. That question seems to have been resolved. Although in the early days of Title I many districts tended to try to reach a larger number of children by spending less per child, local and state reports on the effectiveness of Title I programs now indicate that it's better to spend a larger amount on each child, even if less children are reached.

When educators try to determine which needs are to be met by appropriate programs, one group advocates the teaching of basic skills, another group says cultural, emotional and the basic subsistence needs must first be met. This leads to the further problem of evaluating any compensatory program and whether the means of evaluation are justifiable.

The final problem in the basic definition is the most sustained: Which child can be considered "educationally deprived"? The general consensus is that the best way to determine the answer to that question is through the use of needs assessment and academic tests. This does not negate the allegation, however, that a high correlation exists between economic deprivation and educational disadvantage.

The unanswered questions are at the root of the major legislative changes regarding Title I which are under consideration by Congress. (See p. 55.)

Title I: What Is It?

Title I, ESEA, as passed by Congress in 1965, was intended to provide financial assistance to local school districts in planning and operating special programs for educationally deprived children. It is a supplemental program, and is not intended to be used to supplant any current program provided children in the district. In federal government terminology, it is a categorical aid program, not a general aid program.

In scope, Title I programs are in operation in nearly 16,000 school districts, serving more than eight million children. Eligibility plays a key role in selecting sites for Title I programs. Under Title I any local education agency (LEA) which has at least 10 children, aged 5 to 17, in one or a combination of the following four categories is eligible for Title I funds:

1. Children in resident families with an annual income below $2,000.
2. Children in families with an annual income above $2,000 who receive Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).
3. Children in local institutions for the neglected or delinquent.
4. Children living in foster homes and being supported by public funds.

Some of the kinds of programs supported or assisted with Title I funds are remedial instruction in basic skill areas, such as reading or mathematics, to upgrade the achievement levels of children; hiring of additional teachers and teacher aides to individualize instruction; summer programs which enable students to retain and reinforce material learned during the regular school year; and inservice training programs for teachers and aides.

Also, auxiliary services, such as food, medical and dental services, and clothing may be obtained with Title I funds provided all other resources for such items have been expended. Preschool programs, provided they are instructional and not just babysitting, are also permitted to use funds under the act.

Can Comp Ed Be Held Accountable?

Can compensatory education programs be held accountable, as suggested by some critics who contend that more projects would succeed if they had to meet stated objectives or face nonrenewal? Wilson Riles, California state superintendent of public instruction, sees accountability as compatible with guaranteed success in compensatory education efforts. He says "it is possible to manage a coordinated and comprehensive program for a given target population and to indicate the degree to which all of the funds which provided all of the services have achieved the desired objectives.

"If consolidation efforts were to be undertaken, and such motives were in the interest of effectiveness, efficiency and expansion to eligible children, accountability for program improvement can become a basis for rewarding systems and expanding services to all eligible children through a systematic comprehensive program, planning, implementation, evaluation and audit process," Riles said.

Selecting Target Areas

One of the key elements in Title I is selecting "target areas" for programs. This is done by the local education agency after the state department of education suballocates funds to the agencies within a given county. (How much money each county receives is determi[illegible] USOE according to formula contained in the law.)

The local education agency determines which "eligible attendance areas," that is, schools, will be the target areas by using a complicated formula. The first requirement is that the area contain a high concentration of children from low-income families. The agency may make this determination by choosing a single data source (e.g., census data or AFDC data) or by using a combination of sources. Secondary sources that may be used include health, housing, free lunch, employment statistics or a local survey. Although the agency chooses its data sources according to its own circumstances, it must apply the same criteria districtwide. If multiple sources are used, the agency must "weigh" the different factors used.

The agency determines for each school both the number of children from low-income families and the average percentage of children from such families. It ranks the schools by number and by percentage of children and compares these figures with the district averages in both categories. By using the comparisons, it finally decides the eligible schools. The agency then conducts an educational needs assessment in the target schools to determine which children are most educationally deprived and designs a special program to meet their needs.

Aid to Nonpublic School Children

Title I requires LEAs to provide special educational services for educationally deprived children enrolled in nonpublic schools. Two basic conditions identify eligible children in nonpublic schools: (1) the child must live within the designated target area and (2) the child must be educationally deprived according to criteria established by the state or LEA.

There is, however, no formula or federal regulation that stipulates what kind of services, or what percentage of Title I funded services should be made available to nonpublic school children. However, USOE notes that services for nonpublic school children should be designed according to their assessed needs to be determined after consultation with nonpublic school administrators. Among the means of delivering services to nonpublic school children are the following:

- Dual enrollment--the private school child, while retaining membership in the private school, attends the public school for special educational services on a part-time basis.
- Mobile education services--this can take several forms, including a public school teacher coming onto private school grounds to teach a remedial class; a mobile teaching lab with equipment and a teacher to make scheduled stops; or a specialist working with private school children at the private school.

Parent Involvement Is Required by Law

Although parent participation in Title I programs was always considered desirable by USOE, it wasn't until Title I was amended in 1970 that the law mandated parent involvement. Most of the studies of Head Start programs, which required parental involvement from the beginning, indicated that when parents were involved in the programs they tended to take a more positive attitude toward schools and learning. Also, the children of involved parents tended to be more positive toward school and seemed to have higher motivation toward learning success. With this in mind, Congress amended Title I law to mandate parent advisory councils.

Parent advisory councils (PAC), according to Title I, are to be involved in the planning, development, operation and evaluation of local projects. Although there are no specific details as to the extent of the parents' involvement, some guidelines have been established for their participation. Among the functions of parent advisory councils are the following:

1. To make recommendations concerning the needs of the target population and how these needs can be met.
2. To submit comments to local and state school personnel about local Title I applications.
3. To review evaluations of past and present Title I programs.

While PACs are advisory bodies, LEAs should consider advice from them before making decisions. Beyond the specific guidelines, PACs can jointly decide the additional functions in which they will participate. For example, the parent councils for one area office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs participate in the hiring of Title I staff members for their locales.

One of the primary functions of PACs is to stimulate community interest in the school and provide liaison between other parents and members of the community and the Title I staff.

As parents, council members can better understand the information and the help other parents may need. For instance, the Portsmouth, N.H., school district, at the request of parents, developed a guide for parents interested

NACEDC: An Advisor to the President

NACEDC serves in an advisory capacity to the President and to the Congress regarding Title I, ESEA. The council is composed of 15 members; five are appointed each year by the President. NACEDC's budget for fiscal 1973 was $185,000.

In its seven years of operation, NACEDC has submitted yearly reports on the state of education for disadvantaged children and during that period has made many worthwhile recommendations. A list of the ingredients for any successful compensatory program, as outlined before the Senate education subcommittee by NACEDC Chairman Alfred McElroy in August 1973, appears on p. 64.

in helping their children at home. In Albuquerque, N.M., the LEA hired parents to administer simple language tests. Evaluators trained the testers who then went into homes to record what language was spoken and how much. Evaluators agreed that parents and children felt more comfortable with other parents who spoke the same language.

Early in January 1973, NACEDC held a conference for representatives of parent advisory groups. Experienced PAC members gave the following suggestions for inclusion among NACEDC's 1973 recommendations.

- Complete information and interpretation of Title I should be made available to every parent--and especially to every PAC member.
- The needs of the children in a project should be assessed.
- The program should be designed to meet those needs.
- Parents should be given information on how children are identified as Title I participants.

Comparability—A Source of Confusion

Although the idea of comparability isn't new to Title I, the enforcement of it has created confusion between the federal and state education agencies. Basically, the idea is that Title I funds will not be used to replace or "supplant" state and local funds for general education. Instead, Title I funds will be used to supplement programs. The first set of comparability guidelines went into effect in October 1971. The comparability regulations established five criteria for judging whether Title I schools received roughly the same amount of state and local services as the average of the non-Title I funded schools.

Under the original regulations, comparability was judged by five indicators: (1) ratio of pupils to assigned certified classroom teachers; (2) ratio of pupils to assigned other certified instructional staff; (3) ratio of pupils to assigned noncertified instructional staff; (4) expenditure per pupil for instructional salaries except for amounts based on longevity; (5) expenditure per pupil for instructional materials and supplies.

The new regulations, adopted June 28, 1973, are cut back to three:

1. A single ratio of children to instructional staff may be used (in place of the former categories 1, 2 and 3 listed above).

2. Expenditures per pupil for instructional staff. These expenditures include the total annual salaries of instructional staff less the amount paid for longevity or seniority increases.

3. If criteria 1 and 2 are met, the system is considered in compliance under the new regulations. If the system fails to comply with either criteria, it must then further demonstrate comparability by submitting information on per-pupil expenditures for instructional materials and supplies.

There are two major exceptions to the comparability regulations: separate special education classes are excluded from comparability accounting and school

The 'Hoped For' V. the Reality

Consistent interest as well as consistent confusion reign when "authorizations" and "appropriations" are discussed. Generally, authorizations (the maximum amount authorized for spending) far exceed appropriations (the maximum amount that can be spent in accordance with the budget).

Illustrating the point are the following authorization and appropriation levels for Title I, Part A (formula grants to state departments of education for distribution to local education agencies):

Year	Total Authorization[1]	Total Appropriation[1]
1966	$1,192,981,000	$ 959,000,000
1967	1,430,764,000	1,053,410,000
1968	1,902,136,000	1,191,000,000
1969	2,184,436,000	1,123,127,000
1970	2,523,173,000	1,339,051,000
1971	3,457,408,000	1,500,000,000
1972	4,138,378,000	1,597,500,000
1973	5,097,028,477	1,585,000,000

1) Includes amounts for grants to local educational agencies, state agencies for handicapped (administered by BEH), neglected and delinquent children, and state educational agencies for programs for migratory children and state administration.

Source: U.S. Office of Education

districts designated by the U.S. commissioner of education as enrolling large numbers of students from migratory families must comply with special comparability reporting procedures.

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights said the new regulations and new approaches of federal officials in enforcing the comparability standards offered a "brighter picture" to local education agencies. Whereas 38.2% of 112 districts analyzed by USOE were considered "out of compliance" with the unrevised guidelines, that figure fell to 18.6% under the new regulations.

The new guidelines also "substantially enhance the prospect for gaining compliance," according to a report by the Lawyers' Committee. A local education agency can no longer submit a plan that "promises" to achieve comparability upon notice of violation. Instead, the agency must reassign staff and submit a report of comparable status before it can qualify for Title I funding. In addition, each local education agency must maintain appropriate records for individual schools which document how the funds were spent in that school. Any such records must be open for public inspection.

View of an Insider Who's Out

What went wrong with Title I? Why does it need, in the eyes of its most severe critics, a complete revamping?

The answers suggested in Equal Education by John Hughes, who headed the Title I program for four years, include: money problems, politically hot and cold waters, opposing views on tight or loose federal control over state and local administrators, and differing views on the focus of compensatory efforts. Other observers contend that the $8.7 billion actually spent on Title I between 1966 and 1972 justifies more "successes" than seem to be apparent and that the search for a solution is illusory.

As pointed out by Hughes and his wife, Anne, coauthor of the book, "Amounts authorized and appropriated...and the lateness of the appropriations process in relation to the school year created major unrest among administrators in the field." They also point out that by making less money available, Congress was forcing the states either to spend less per child or to concentrate funds on a limited number of children.

Hughes says the federal compensatory effort veered off its intended path not only due to the smaller amount of funds actually available but also due to administration problems at the federal, state and local level. Although the Title I management, according to Hughes, wanted to enforce strict regulations, administrators at state and local levels wanted to use the money with as few restrictions as possible--in some cases, using Title I funds to supplant local funds instead of as a supplement to them.

A "national strategy for education" proposed in the book by Hughes includes the following elements:

- Elevating education to the fully acknowledged status of a human right and translating that right into a legislative mandate.
- A formula for funding that would take into consideration all the needs of the poor in addition to education.
- Starting at as early an age as possible to provide economically disadvantaged children with educational, health and nutritional services.
- Equalization of state and local funds for all clients within the state before a state can qualify for federal funds.
- The initiation of performance pacts whereby the burden for success of the educational process would transfer from the student to the school. This system, according to Hughes, would guarantee leverage on the school system to the poor.

(Equal Opportunity: A New National Strategy; Indiana U. Press, 1972)

EIGHT APPROACHES TO COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

When most people talk about compensatory education, what they are really talking about is the general Title I program operated by local education agencies for educationally deprived children. This is, of course, the single largest outlay in USOE's compensatory education plan with a 1972 appropriation of $1.565 billion.

Title I general programs are not, however, the only compensatory education efforts of the federal government. Educationally disadvantaged students are also aided under Head Start; Follow Through; postsecondary education programs; Title III, ESEA; Title VII, ESEA; Title I Special Migrant Programs; Indian Education Act; and the Right To Read program.

Details on each program follow.

Head Start

Head Start was officially launched amid much fanfare in 1965 as one of the key parts of the late Pres. Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. Initially, the program was under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but it is now administered by HEW's Office of Child Development (OCD). The aim remains the same: to meet the "total needs" of the 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children of the poor. The "total needs," subject to some variation in the 2,072 programs in operation in 1972-73, include health services and nutrition, education, parent involvement and social services.

Admittedly, Head Start is a demonstration program only. It cannot begin to serve all eligible children. In 1973, for instance, 269,929 children were enrolled in full-year Head Start programs (which run from 8 to 12 months) and 25,088 children were enrolled in summer programs (from 6 to 8 weeks). But a Head Start spokesman said that's still only about 18% of the children eligible for service. The spokesman also stated that 25% of the program's grant money in fiscal 1973 was being used to support 1.5% of the total number of programs and that those programs are located in big cities.

Head Start's budget has inched upward from its fiscal 1971 level of $361 million to $368.9 million in fiscal 1972 and $392.1 million in fiscal 1973. As the program moved into fiscal 1974, it anticipated an increase of $15.7 million over the fiscal 1973 amount (subject to Congressional approval).

New directions have surfaced for Head Start programs around the country. OCD has identified two principal goals for renewing and enriching Head Start.

The goals are: (1) to achieve acceptable standards of performance in all Head Start programs and in all component areas and (2) to convert Head Start to a multiform program, one that draws on a wide range of approaches to provide cost-effective, individualized services. In 1972, HEW contracted with the Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corp. to collect and analyze Head Start budgetary data to "more accurately estimate the money needed for adequate funding of quality programs and appropriate distribution of funds." Some of Pacific T. & T.A.'s findings are given in the box below.

Other new directions include the following:

Performance Standards Required — In an attempt to improve local program quality all Head Start project directors were issued a statement of performance standards covering all aspects of their programs. They were given until June 30, 1974, to be in full compliance as a condition for further funding. In general, the performance standards pertain to the methods and processes used by the Head Start programs to meet the needs of children, rather than to measure outcomes or performance of the children themselves. The performance standards apply to the four basic Head Start components: education, social services, parent involvement and health services (which encompasses medical, dental, mental health and nutrition). Upon written notice of noncompliance, the program grantee has 90 days to correct a deficiency or face suspension or termination proceedings.

How Much Does It Cost To Serve a Child's 'Total' Needs?

- Does transportation cost more in rural areas than in urban?
- Is there a relationship between health costs and regions?
- What does it cost to provide psychological services in rural areas without access to public mental health facilities?
- What is the cost per child in part-day vs. full-day programs?
- Is program size related to administrative cost?

These are the types of questions Head Start officials wanted to have answered as they tried to relate program costs with program quality. In analyzing the proposed fiscal 1971 budget costs of 173 Head Start projects serving 45,391 children in six regions of the country, Pacific T. & T.A. came up with the following conclusions:

- The over-all cost per child per day is $6.58.
- The over-all cost of full-day programs exceeds that of part-day programs: $7.15 and $6.34 per child per day, respectively.
- Part-day rural programs are more expensive per child per day than part-day urban programs: $6.52 and $6.18, respectively.
- Full-day rural programs likewise cost more per child per day than those in urban areas: $7.30 and $6.63, respectively.
- For both part-day and full-day programs, large programs (serving from 200 to 800 children) cost less per child per day than smaller programs (serving 200 children or fewer). The report cautioned, however, that cost figures alone cannot answer the crucial questions regarding the program's quality.

Local Program Options

Local Head Start programs may vary their operation within the limits of five options: (1) the "standard" five-days-per-week center-based approach; (2) varying the attendance at the center by scheduling less than five days per week or combining home and center care; (3) home-based programs similar to the experimental "Home Start" model; (4) double sessions (directors are cautioned they cannot reduce services to children already in the program when new children are added); (5) locally designed variations (derived from the present Head Start model or representing a more effective approach to meeting the needs of children in the community).

Experimental Programs

In addition to the programs that have already resulted as spin-offs from Head Start (i.e., Follow Through, Health Start, Parent-Child Centers, Home Start), some new experiments in early child care are being tried by Head Start, according to a March 1973 report to the Congress. These include: Child and Family Resource Program which will use Head Start as the nucleus of a child-centered program of individualized family services starting at the prenatal period; "Developmental Continuity" to explore new approaches to bridging the developmental gap between Head Start and school; and projects to provide comprehensive services to preschool handicapped children.

Child Development Associate

The Child Development Associate (CDA) project, started in late 1972, is an approach to preparing and certificating child care staff in Head Start, day care and private nursery schools. The Child Development Associate Consortium, an independent association aided by a grant from OCD, has as its goals: to define the competencies needed by a CDA, to develop procedures assessing the performance of CDA candidates, to train personnel to achieve competence if they do not already possess it and to develop a credential that will take into account differences in state laws and children's needs.

Head Start for Handicapped Children

In line with a legislative mandate of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1972, Head Start directed local programs to focus on inclusion of handicapped children in their 1973 recruitment and enrollment efforts. The legislation specifically stated that "not less than 10% of the total number of enrollment opportunities in Head Start programs shall be available for handicapped children." The 10% minimum was to be met by the fall of 1973. HEW estimated in a report to Congress in March 1973 that at that time approximately 15,000 handicapped children were enrolled in full-year programs with 2,000 additional handicapped children in summer programs. The report conceded that substantial numbers of eligible children were not registered due to several reasons: families are not aware that their children are eligible and local programs do not encourage and may in fact discourage their participation.

As defined in the legislation, handicapped are those children who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled or who have other health impairments requiring special education and related services. Implementing the mandate is no

simple matter. As pointed out in the report to Congress, six critical areas need attention and improvement for Head Start programs to meet the special needs of handicapped children: (1) better techniques for identification of handicapped children, (2) closer relationships with other community and state agencies in planning, recruitment and provision of services, (3) training of all staff and volunteers, (4) innovative approaches to the special needs of parents of handicapped children, (5) greater involvement of volunteers with special skills, (6) focusing resources on staff training, equipment and modification of facilities.

Head Start Fee Schedule

As part of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments passed in September 1972, the secretary of HEW was directed to establish a fee schedule for families of Head Start enrollees whose income exceeds $4,320 per year. In a report accompanying the legislative mandate, Congress recognized the "desirability of a socioeconomic mix of children" in the Head Start program. It also pointed out that Head Start should "continue to focus on children from low-income families and that the very poor children are to have a distinct preference." The fee schedule went into effect when it was published in the April 16, 1973, Federal Register. Charges vary according to family income, number of children in the family and number of children from the family enrolled in the program. For example, a family with more than two children enrolled pays one fee for the first two children and 25% of that fee for each additional child. The regulations covering the fee schedule are detailed and must be read carefully. Funds derived from the operation of the fee schedule were to be retained by the individual program and to be used "to further Head Start program objectives," with the further stipulation that "these funds cannot be applied toward the federal or nonfederal share requirement."

Is Head Start Working?

HEW funds a number of studies to evaluate the effects of Head Start. One that may have a major impact on Head Start and other early education programs is being conducted by Educational Testing Service (ETS). The study, Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experience: ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study, began in 1967 with the selection of 1,800 children in four sites: Lee County, Ala.; Portland, Ore.; St. Louis, Mo.; and Trenton, N.J. In 1969 the actual project began with the testing of children aged three and one-half to four and one-half. All were scheduled to enter first grade during 1971. The study will follow their development through the third grade or until 1974.

What ETS is trying to discover is the variety of conditions that might occur under the heading of "disadvantaged child" and how those conditions affect his chance to develop. At an April 1972 symposium at Johns Hopkins U., Virginia C. Shipman noted that the most striking aspect of the facts gathered up to that time was "wide range of variation in performance exhibited.... Children from low-income families span a much wider range of cognitive, personal-social and perceptual functioning than some would have us believe."

Some interesting facts that have emerged from the early part of the ETS study bear on Head Start. In three of the four study sites that had Head

Start programs, Head Start seemed to be reaching the children who need it most. The study compares children in Head Start to children in other preschool programs, and to children who had apparently had no preschool experiences. The study shows, Mrs. Shipman said, that "those families who enrolled the study child in Head Start were, on the average, characterized by greater deprivation than those families who sent their child to another preschool program or apparently did not enroll their child in any kind of preschool program. Thus participation in Head Start was generally by those who would appear to need it most."

Another interesting pattern in the early data was that mothers of Head Start children seemed to be more involved in the community. In contrast to mothers of children in other programs or in no program, Head Start families expressed somewhat more favorable attitudes toward local schools, participated somewhat more in the community, and expressed more active responsibility for their child's school performance.

Follow Through

Follow Through is a research and evaluation program designed to find the most effective way to educate low-income children in the early grades, basically K-3. As its name implies, the program was conceived in 1967 as one that could capitalize on the gains made by children in Head Start programs. When it first started, Follow Through served 2,900 children and was supposed to operate with a budget of $120 million. This, however, was reduced to $15 million for a two-year period--a cut of more than 90%.

Funding increased in fiscal 1969 ($32 million) and peaked in fiscal 1970 ($70 million), but has been on the decline ever since: $69 million in fiscal 1971, $63 million in fiscal 1972, $57.8 million in fiscal 1973.

In 1973, Follow Through is serving approximately 90,000 children in 4,000 classrooms in all 50 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico. An estimated 80% of these children are from low-income families. The program provides pupils with instructional programs and general health services including dental care, nutritional meals and other physical and emotional supports. Although Follow Through funds may be used for "intensive reeducation of teachers in curricular models" and for parent activities (training as teacher aides, "effective observers, and decision makers in education"), the money cannot be used to pay salaries of regular teachers during the normal school day. Any spending for construction of new facilities or for other purposes that are normally the fiscal responsibility of the school system is also forbidden.

Follow Through administrators say one distinctive contribution of the program is that it has allowed communities to choose the educational concept and approach model most appropriate for "improving the life chances" of its children. The 22 Follow Through models were selected as promising methods for working with low-income children. They fall into five broad categories:

1. Highly structured: The models in this group emphasize programmed instructional techniques in highly structured educational environments.
2. Discovery: These models focus on the child's initiative in learning and development of academic skills through promoting exploration and discovery.

3. Eclectic: The concepts of these models vary. In general, they include diverse elements ranging from open-ended inquiry to structured teaching of specific academic skills.
4. Self-sponsored: This group includes models in which the local school district staff has played the role of curricular architect and developer of the project.
5. Parent-implemented: Models in this category have no specific affiliation with a particular instructional approach. Differing in style and tactics, this group shares a commitment to high levels of parent participation in policy making and program planning.

For more information on the 22 Follow Through Models, write to Mrs. Rosemary Wilson, Director, Follow Through, U.S. Office of Education, 7th and D Sts. SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.

An initial step in the national evaluation of Follow Through by Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in 1969-70 was based on a sample of 5,800 kindergarten and first-grade children in 14 models. When matched with similar children in regular school programs, Follow Through children, especially those from low-income families, made greater achievement gains. Follow Through children also developed more positive attitudes toward school and learning, and this was most evident in low-income groups.

In SRI's report of March 1973, covering evaluation data through 1971, it summed up the still tentative findings on Follow Through: "The overall impact of Follow Through on pupil growth and development, and on parent and teacher attitudes and behaviors, is positive, significant and increasing in magnitude over time. Effects become stronger on children as they progress through the program...and on successive groups of children entering the program."

A preliminary analysis of 1972 data on Follow Through by Abt Associates (to be available in September 1973) gives positive results relating to kindergarten achievement scores: Most schools in which Follow Through kindergartens were located were accruing an advantage in word analysis, reading and mathematics subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

What's the Future of Follow Through?

According to a program status report of USOE's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) in March 1973, "for the past two years only those Follow Through projects being operated in accordance with program criteria have been invited to reapply; no new projects have been invited to participate in the program."

A long range plan was developed to phase out Follow Through over a five-year period. BESE reported that "beginning in school year 1974-75, federal support for the entering grade (kindergarten or first grade) of each project will be terminated. In each succeeding year, the next higher grade will be dropped from the project, until by the end of the 1976-77 school year, the final third grades will have been dropped and...Follow Through will have ended." BESE notes that the approaches identified as successful will be disseminated for schools to use in improving education of disadvantaged children.

Providing Postsecondary Education for the Disadvantaged

Compensatory education programs for college-bound youngsters have not received much attention, but they do exist. Three programs, Upward Bound, Talent Search and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, represent the federal government's major effort to bring educational opportunity to the economically, culturally or educationally disadvantaged student.

All three programs are funded under Title IV of the amended Higher Education Act of 1965 and are administered by HEW's 10 regional offices under the guiding hand of HEW's Bureau of Higher Education.

For the academic year 1972-73, projects operated in all 50 states with "forward funds" of $49 million--the 1972 appropriation. The primary criteria for eligibility is the low-income factor, and, additionally, many students also belong to ethnic minorities. For instance, HEW reports that 44,000 Spanish-surnamed, 25,000 American Indian and 88,000 black students took part in 1972-73 programs. Following is a brief sketch of HEW's "Trio Programs":

TALENT SEARCH

Participation: Students from seventh grade and up.
Number of projects: 104, serving 125,000 students in 1972-73.
Appropriation: $5 million (fiscal 1972).
Special Features: Works closely with schools and community agencies to identify students with academic potential; actively involves youth groups to find those who may have been overlooked in "traditional settings." Students receive information about educational opportunities in colleges and universities, vocational and technical schools and on-the-job training. They also receive placement assistance and information on sources of financial aid.

UPWARD BOUND

Participation: Generally, students are recruited at the completion of 10th or 11th grade.
Number of projects: 316, serving 25,000 students in 1972-73.
Appropriation: $29.6 million (fiscal 1972).
Special Features: Upward Bound attempts to help students "turned off" by the traditional values of schooling. Students are given intensive preparation for entry into postsecondary programs including counseling, special classes and tutoring.
(The June 1973 issue of American Education reports that 68% of Upward Bound graduates enroll in college, with an additional 6% "planning to enter other postsecondary education programs.")

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Participation: Students in postsecondary institutions who may suffer from academic deficiencies, physical impairment or lack of financial resources.
Number of projects: 208, serving 48,000 students in 1972-73.
Appropriation: $14 million (fiscal 1972).
Special Features: The Special Services program attempts to keep students in school by providing benefits such as counseling, tutoring, remedial summer programs and information on sources of financial aid.

Postsecondary Education Programs for the Disadvantaged, 1972

	SPECIAL SERVICES		TALENT SEARCH		UPWARD BOUND	
	Projects	Dollars	Projects	Dollars	Projects	Dollars
Alabama	5	$ 364,847	2	$ 93,624	7	$ 599,304
Alaska	1	131,025	1	77,820	1	289,029
Arizona	4	265,000	1	42,000	3	357,616
Arkansas	3	191,000	2	63,420	6	541,800
California	24	2,015,135	11	610,421	22	1,947,827
Colorado	6	295,000	2	116,190	5	361,594
Connecticut	2	175,200	3	97,420	8	639,869
Delaware	1	39,600	2	37,680	2	130,200
District of Columbia	1	140,800	2	165,000	3	243,000
Florida	6	417,018	2	88,949	7	778,035
Georgia	6	469,523	2	95,064	9	1,080,917
Hawaii	1	83,000	1	61,500	1	89,000
Idaho	2	46,000	1	42,000	2	143,000
Illinois	7	385,150	5	267,520	10	977,643
Indiana	2	138,300	2	57,940	7	590,839
Iowa	1	86,250	1	36,140	6	641,835
Kansas	2	139,000	1	34,000	2	193,000
Kentucky	6	351,403	2	91,706	8	851,225
Louisiana	4	371,800	3	133,000	8	725,000
Maine	1	74,500	-	-	3	249,807
Maryland	4	270,000	1	65,000	5	380,224
Massachusetts	4	257,592	3	138,180	2	1,216,310
Michigan	5	378,773	2	98,700	9	869,263
Minnesota	3	275,755	2	72,380	4	418,053
Mississippi	6	352,281	1	43,965	6	485,684
Missouri	3	215,000	1	60,940	5	434,242
Montana	4	182,799	1	54,000	3	238,480
Nebraska	2	124,377	1	40,000	3	211,000
Nevada	2	104,719	1	47,629	2	144,200
New Hampshire	-	-	1	42,300	2	118,358
New Jersey	4	300,993	3	126,435	10	955,804
New Mexico	4	309,900	2	135,200	3	302,670
New York	12	909,000	5	243,125	20	2,332,310
North Carolina	9	552,757	2	120,161	11	887,167
North Dakota	2	85,000	1	60,690	2	182,492
Ohio	5	468,449	3	142,880	12	1,269,806
Oklahoma	5	287,800	2	73,900	8	691,900
Oregon	4	179,258	2	54,000	4	310,531
Pennsylvania	4	292,040	2	97,000	15	1,366,854
Rhode Island	1	49,993	1	31,960	1	76,911
South Carolina	5	263,199	1	52,900	4	382,405
South Dakota	2	90,000	1	35,000	2	167,251
Tennessee	4	271,572	2	100,381	8	810,243
Texas	8	601,619	6	355,200	13	1,192,900
Utah	1	50,000	1	65,940	4	237,824
Vermont	1	73,500	1	15,980	1	64,000
Virginia	4	267,124	2	86,000	8	686,759
Washington	4	172,000	4	143,900	6	399,799
West Virginia	4	216,390	1	56,000	5	636,489
Wisconsin	3	196,552	1	64,860	3	291,300
Wyoming	1	40,000	-	-	1	71,850
Guam	-	-	-	-	1	92,686
Puerto Rico	3	157,000	1	64,000	2	160,000
Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-	1	82,400
TOTALS	208	$14,174,993	104	$5,000,000	316	$29,599,285

Source: American Education, June 1973

Title III, ESEA

Since its inception in 1965, Title III, ESEA, has aimed at finding "creative solutions" to educational problems through development activities and demonstration of model practices. Title III attempts to use the experimental findings of the laboratory/educational research, the experimenter and the educational establishment, thus acting as the link between innovator and consumer (elementary and secondary schools).

Figures gathered during fiscal year 1972 give some idea of the impact of Title III. During that year, more than 1,700 projects were in operation involving more than 7 million elementary and secondary students in direct participation (face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers) and more than 12 million students in indirect participation.

In 1972, 803 new projects were funded, bringing the total of new projects funded since 1966 to 4,463. The average cost of a project was approximately $60,000.

Approximately 900,000 compensatory education students have been involved in Title III projects designed to demonstrate solutions to their unique needs. Title III also makes possible the participation of private school children, and during 1972 more than 347,000 children from nonpublic schools participated directly, and more than 888,000 participated indirectly.

Title III administrators claim success for the program by pointing out that over 67% of Title III projects have been continued after three years of federal funding. In one year alone, the administrators say, over 1,000 school districts (other than those with Title III grants) have adopted one or more Title III projects).

The authorization and appropriation figures for Title III are as follows:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$100,000,000	$ 75,000,000
1967	175,000,000	135,000,000
1968	500,000,000	187,876,000
1969	512,500,000	164,876,000
1970	550,000,000	116,393,000
1971	550,000,000	143,243,000
1972	575,000,000	146,248,000
1973	575,000,000	146,393,000

In 1969 the major administrative responsibility for Title III was shifted from USOE to the individual states. (Grants under state plans account for 85%

of the Title III total; the remaining 15% is used according to the discretion of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.) The transfer legislation mandated that an educational needs assessment would be conducted in each state to determine how Title III funds would be used to demonstrate solutions to "critical educational needs."

Efforts to improve Title III as a vehicle for educational change at state and local levels have continued, and refinements of the strategies, methods and techniques of implementing change have been developed and tested, according to Title III adminstrators.

State Plan Change Model

Title III's "State Plan Change Model" follows six sequential steps:

1. Determining the critical education needs of the learner.
2. Assisting in the development of projects that will meet the learner's needs.
3. Selecting, funding and implementing the most promising projects.
4. Assessing the results of evaluations and validations of the projects.
5. Disseminating the results of the evaluations and validations.
6. Adopting in other schools those programs that have improved the learner's performance.

Title III administrators say the state plan program is one of USOE's most flexible programs and could be used by a state department of education to meet any urgent program-related need, particularly in the interim between recognition of a need and development and funding of legislation.

With specific reference to compensatory education programs, Title III administrators are aiming at establishing a "bank of validated alternative solutions that work" and presumably could be applied to the specific needs of disadvantaged children.

As part of the "Identification/Validation/Dissemination" program sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education in cooperation with the states, 107 Title III projects were validated.

Each validated project was reviewed by an out-of-state evaluation team which determined that the project "met certain criteria relating to innovativeness and exportability and showed evidence of significant pupil achievement or improvement and that the project was cost-effective." Many of these programs demonstrate ways of meeting the needs of the disadvantaged.

Information on the 107 projects is available from the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, 2130 H St. NW, Suite 714, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Title VII, ESEA: Bilingual Education

The Bilingual Education Program was authorized in 1967 when Title VII was added by an amendment to ESEA. The program provides financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and implement demonstration programs which utilize new approaches, instructional services and activities designed to meet the special needs of children who come from environments where the predominant language is other than English and where there are concentrations of children from low-income families. USOE estimates there are five million language minority school children who need to be served.

Appropriations for Title VII have been as follows: $7.5 million in fiscal 1969; $25 million in fiscal 1970 ($21.5 million released); $25 million in fiscal 1971; $35 million in fiscal 1972; $35 million in fiscal 1973. During this period 216 projects have been funded in 33 states, serving approximately 125,000 children. In 1972, approximately 109,000 children were being aided in Title VII programs. Most of the funds have been used to develop demonstration programs which USOE intends to be used as models for other districts. Title VII officials admit, however, that bilingual children, for the most part, live in areas where school districts do not have money to implement programs to meet the children's needs.

Grants are awarded on a 12-month basis and assistance may be provided up to five years. As a condition of continued funding, school districts are asked to gradually assume the costs following the second grant period. Seventy-one projects will complete the five-year cycle at the end of the 1973-74 school year.

Evaluation of Title VII programs has been on a project-by-project basis. Individual evaluations have been checked by independent educational auditors in accordance with the accountability concept developed for the program. A national evaluation of selected projects currently in progress will enable the program to make comparisons across projects and to formulate a plan for assessing the impact of the total program, according to Title VII administrators.

The largest non-English speaking groups are Mexican-Americans (mainly in the Southwest), Puerto Ricans (mainly in the East), and Cubans (mainly in the South). The number of children in those groups that could benefit from bilingual education programs ranges from 2.4 million to 3.5 million.

A list of the pilot projects funded under Title VII during fiscal 1972 appears on page 22. Although the majority of projects serve children from Spanish-speaking backgrounds, 22 other languages are included. Children still needing bilingual education include the American Indians, and children speaking Chinese, French, Portuguese, Japanese and Chamorro.

The two main problems which have yet to be solved, say Title VII administrators, are:

1. Development of a total instructional package for bilingual education for the 22 different language groups from grades prekindergarten through 12.

2. Establishment of training courses for teachers.

Bilingual Education Pilot Programs
Title VII, ESEA (Fiscal 1972)

State	Number of Districts	Languages	Number of Children	Grant Amount
Alaska	1	Yuk (Eskimo)	218	$ 187,000
Arizona	10	Spanish; Navajo (Indian)	3,043	1,010,656
California	62	Spanish; Portuguese; Chinese; Pomo (Indian)	27,138	10,421,000
Colorado	7	Spanish; Navajo (Indian); Ute (Indian)	4,053	875,522
Connecticut	3	Spanish	1,173	406,750
Florida	3	Spanish; Miccosukee (Indian)	552	920,000
Guam	1	Chamorro	273	203,500
Idaho	1	Spanish	369	100,000
Illinois	2	Spanish	1,049	544,136
Indiana	2	Spanish	478	247,193
Louisiana	4	French; Spanish	1,484	547,029
Maine	3	French; Passamaquoddy (Indian)	761	340,793
Massachusetts	7	Spanish; Portuguese	1,667	808,517
Michigan	4	Spanish	1,670	464,401
Montana	3	Cree (Indian); Crow (Indian); Northern Cheyenne (Indian)	435	359,514
New Hampshire	1	French	195	177,000
New Jersey	4	Spanish	2,244	849,628
New Mexico	12	Spanish; Navajo (Indian); Zuni (Indian); Laguna-Keresan (Indian); Acoma-Keresan (Indian)	3,064	1,449,891
New York	26	Spanish; Chinese; French (Haitian)	16,516	4,406,349
Ohio	1	Spanish	331	118,543
Oklahoma	3	Cherokee (Indian); Chocktaw (Indian); Seminole (Indian)	1,175	470,377
Oregon	1	Spanish; Russian	295	139,600
Pennsylvania	2	Spanish	2,849	627,259
Puerto Rico	1	Spanish	320	88,000
Rhode Island	2	Portuguese; Spanish	350	248,680
South Dakota	1	Lakota (Indian-Oalala-Sioux)	198	136,095
Texas	42	Spanish	35,641	6,555,520
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	1	Palauan and Ponapean	44	70,000
Utah	1	Navajo (Indian)	329	133,900
Vermont	1	French	166	82,520
Virgin Islands	1	Spanish	130	100,000
Washington	2	Spanish	264	267,943
Wisconsin	1	Spanish	343	148,917
33	216		108,817	$33,506,433

Source: U.S. Office of Education

Aid to Children of Migrant Families

In terms of needs and the number of children involved, programs to aid children of migrant families rank fairly high. Approximately 500,000 children of school age fall into the migrant category. The needs of migrants were pointed up in a 1972 report by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (chaired by Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn.). According to Mondale's committee, migrant children have a median educational level of 6.2 years; 17% of them are illiterate; and 25% either have never attended school or have not gone beyond the fourth grade. An additional need is cited by HEW in its booklet, Program Descriptions and Program Status Reports, 1973. HEW says advancement of mechanized agricultural technology is decreasing the need for migrant labor, thus indicating a need to expose migrant children to alternative vocational and prevocational training.

Since 1966, children of migratory workers have received benefits from federal programs, under an amendment to Title I, ESEA. HEW estimates that 400,000 migrant children were receiving educational and special supplementary services under Title I in 1972-73. Approximately 85% of those children were in elementary school programs.

"Eligible under Title I programs are children who have moved with their families from one school district to another during a year so that a parent or other family members can obtain work in agriculture or related food processing activities." These children are further broken down into three groups: interstate migrant children, intrastate migrant children and formerly migratory children.

- Interstate: A child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across state boundaries in order that a parent, guardian or member of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture or in related food processing activities. The child is expected to continue to migrate with his parent or guardian.

- Intrastate: A child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across school district boundaries within a state in order that a parent, guardian or member of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture or in related food processing activities.

- Formerly Migratory (Five Year Migrants): A child who has been a migrant as defined above but who, along with his parent or guardian, has ceased to migrate within the last five years and now resides in an area in which a program for migratory children is to be provided.

Projects serving children of migrant families must be designed to meet the specific and special educational needs of these children. Funds can be used to provide services for:

- Improving the educational program offered to migrant children through such techniques as bilingual education.
- Hiring additional teachers, aides, counselors and social workers needed for such programs.

- Providing recreational, cultural and library services.
- Training staff members to understand the needs and culture of the migrant child.
- Purchasing educational materials, including mobile classrooms to follow the children from camp to camp, bilingual course materials, art supplies and industrial arts and prevocational equipment.

Funds for programs for migrant children have increased since the first appropriation in fiscal 1967, as shown by the following:

Title I Appropriations for Programs for Migrant Children

FY 1967	$ 9,737,847
FY 1968	41,692,425
FY 1969	45,556,074
FY 1970	51,014,319
FY 1971	57,608,680
FY 1972	64,822,920
FY 1973	72,772,187

MSRTS: Computerized Record Keeping

One of the difficulties in providing services for children of migrant families has been the mobility of the families themselves--up to five moves in one year. In addition, the combined hardships brought on by poverty (average family income is about $3,600) and disease place strain on the child, his family and the school system which tries to meet his multiple and sometimes unknown needs.

As a starting place to attack these multiple problems, a communications network called the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) is gaining prominence. Funded under Title I, ESEA, and in existence on a national level since 1971, MSRTS is being cited as one of the outstanding "success stories" of Title I compensatory efforts. Funding for the record transfer system is set aside from the Title I migrant program authorization. The amount of funding has been as follows: $650,000 in fiscal 1970; $3.1 million in fiscal 1971; $1.9 million in fiscal 1972; and $725,000 in fiscal 1973.

MSRTS has three primary functions: (1) to provide quick and efficient assistance for educators in meeting the educational and health needs of individual migrant children by transmitting a cumulative record to a school upon request; (2) to accumulate information as specified by the National Record Transfer Committee on children of agricultural and agriculturally related workers; (3) to provide summary statistical data to USOE and participating states for management purposes. All 48 mainland states are participating in MSRTS.

The system also provides benefits to teachers, administrators and the migrant child by indicating the types of educational programs he was previously enrolled in and his performances in various tests. By providing the standard transfer form, schools and health personnel can reduce the amount of clerical effort normally expended to obtain such data.

Some 130 terminals--simple teletype machines connected to the central data bank at the U. of Arkansas Medical Center in Little Rock via a leased line and to area schools via telephone--have been set up across the country. The operations are simple. When a child arrives at a school, regardless of the time of year, the school clerk asks the child if he has brought a copy of his record with him. If so, the clerk calls the nearest terminal, identifies himself by code, and submits an enrollment notice for the central bank's records. He also requests an updated version of the student's records.

If the child does not have his record, the clerk need only ask for the key data--child's name, sex, birthdate and birthplace. In response, the computer will supply the student's ID number, his current math and reading level and any chronic or critical health conditions. Then, using the student's ID number, the clerk can request a transcript of the student's records.

For More Information: State Migrant Centers

With the blessing of HEW, eight state departments of education have moved ahead in setting up migrant education centers to provide information and to aid Title I migrant programs in their own and other states. Additional functions performed and coordinated by the centers include: providing inservice training for teachers and aides, serving as liaison between parents and schools, producing teaching materials, evaluating state migrant programs, coordinating statewide migrant preschool and youth programs.

ARIZONA
Arizona Migrant Child Education Lab
College of Education
Arizona State U.
Tempe, Ariz. 85281
Nicholas Silvaroli, Director

IDAHO
Migrant Education Resource Center
312 Third St. S.
Nampa, Idaho 83651
Brent McDonald, Director

MICHIGAN
Migrant Education Center
Central Michigan U.
Mt. Pleasant, Mich. 48858
Rudolph Garcia, Director

NEW YORK
New York State Migrant Center
State U. College
Geneseo, N.Y. 14454
Gloria Mattera, Director

NORTH CAROLINA
Migrant Education Center
P.O. Box 948
Grifton, N.C. 28530
Arch E. Manning, Director

OREGON
Migrant Education Service Center
1300 Market St.
Salem, Ore. 97304
Kay Birge, Director

TEXAS
Migrant Educational Development Center
800 Brazos St.
Austin, Tex. 78701
Antonio Garcia, Director

WASHINGTON
Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education
P.O. Box 329
Toppenish, Wash. 98948
Lloyd Gabriel, Director

Indian Education

Roughly 250,000 American Indian children attend elementary and secondary schools in the United States. About 177,000 attend public schools, approximately 51,000 attend BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) schools, and the remainder attend various kinds of private schools.

Federal aid to Indian education has been provided through several different avenues: Title I, ESEA; Title VII, ESEA; and Title VIII, ESEA. Joining this list as the latest federal aid program for Indian education is the Indian Education Act of 1972. (More details below.)

Why the Push for Indian Education?

Increasingly, Indians have been asking for more involvement in and control over the education of their children. Their view was seconded by the 1969 Kennedy Subcommittee Report on Indian Education. The subcommittee found:

- Dropout rates for Indians are twice the national average in both public and private schools.
- Achievement levels of Indians are two to three years below those of white students.
- One-fourth of elementary and secondary-school teachers would prefer not to teach Indian children.
- Only 18% of Indian students go to college.

A USOE-financed study of Indian education by Robert Havighurst stressed Indian control over all phases of their education. And Pres. Nixon endorsed Indian control over decision making in a 1970 speech. Yet, a 1971 booklet, "An Even Chance," by the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, found that Indians really had little control over their education. Based on interviews with state and local officials, BIA and USOE officials, and Indian parents in eight states, the NAACP found the following:

- Indian parents are keenly interested in education, but they are alienated from the public schools and excluded from decision making.
- Most Indian parents think their children are not learning.
- Many parents were afraid to talk frankly with interviewers. They feared exposure, harassment of their children, and possible loss of their jobs.
- In virtually every school system, Indian parents knew nothing about Title I or Johnson-O'Malley, the federal programs which could be used to meet their children's educational needs. They were not involved in these programs, despite federal regulations calling for their participation.

The Indian Education Act of 1972

The Indian Education Act of 1972 (authorized under the Education Amendments of 1972) funded projects ranging from a model comprehensive compensatory education program in Boston, Mass., to a bilingual/bicultural program for Alaskan village schools in Bethel. Although the $18 million in fiscal 1973 funds for the act were originally impounded by the Administration in

the fall of 1972, the money was finally released and the awards announced in early August 1973 by USOE. Of the fiscal 1973 amount, $17 million went to local school districts and American Indian organizations to improve educational opportunities for Indian children and adults; $1 million was set aside for administration costs. Each project received funds for one year only.

The President had asked Congress to rescind any fiscal 1973 appropriation for the act and to appropriate no money in fiscal 1974. He said the Indian Education Act and the funding for it duplicated other programs. (The act had been recommended for full funding and implementation by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity in its December 1972 report.)

To assure Indian participation in the new program, the act required that all projects receiving funds had to be developed in cooperation with the Indian population to be served. In addition, a 15-member National Advisory Council on Indian Education, appointed by the President and composed of American Indians and Alaska natives, participated in the review of proposals.

The act is seen as a giant step forward in Indian control of their own educational programs. Commenting on the new act before the Fourth Annual Indian Education Conference in November 1972, Asst. Secy. for Education Sidney Marland said: "There is now, for the first time, a clearly established power base...for direct and specific support of Indian education--by Indians. There is no other education law remotely approaching this law in its degree of focus. Most of our laws are scattershot. This one is a rifle."

The programs, to be administered by USOE's Office of Indian Education (created under the act), break into four main categories:

PART A:
Recipient of awards: 436 local school districts in 31 states.
Purpose: To develop programs responsive to special educational needs of Indian students in public schools, e.g., educational programs, minor classroom remodeling and equipment.
Number of students: 135,000.
Amount of grants: $10,952,376

PART A, SPECIAL:
Purpose: To provide for demonstration programs at Indian-controlled schools located on or near reservations.
Number of grants: 10 grants to schools and centers in 7 states.
Amount of grants: $547,618 (This amount, by law, cannot exceed more than 5% of the funds allocated under Part A.)

PART B:
Purpose: To fund special projects in such areas as bilingual/bicultural education, compensatory education, cultural enrichment, drop-out prevention and vocational training.
Number of grants: 51 grants in 21 states.
Amount of grants: $5 million.

PART C:
Purpose: To provide special adult education programs, including efforts

to help Indian adults obtain high school diplomas, improve their communication skills and participate in career development programs.

Number of grants: 10 grants in 8 states and Washington, D.C.
Amount of grants: $500,000.

Right To Read: Concentration on the Basic 'R'

In addition to the estimated 7 million elementary and secondary students who can be considered "educationally disadvantaged" due to their lack of reading skills, USOE estimates that 19 million adults are totally or functionally illiterate. The need is not unrecognized; parents, state and national assessment groups, legislators and educators are becoming increasingly aware of the problem. Yet,there is no specific federal reading legislation.

Federal funds for reading programs (nearly $500 million in fiscal 1972) are scattered under a variety of programs, including bilingual education, library services, and Titles I and III of ESEA. Even the Right To Read program, the federal government's main effort to eliminate illiteracy, derived its fiscal 1972 funding ($12 million) from discretionary funds drawn from many legislative sources. Right To Read's situation improved with specific provision for funding under the Cooperative Research Act and an additional $2.2 million authorized under the Emergency School Aid Act.

Under the direction of Ruth Love Holloway, who came to USOE from California's Division of Compensatory Education, Right To Read was concentrating its efforts in the following ways in mid-1973:

- Demonstration programs in 240 school-based and community-based settings.
- Direct funding of Right To Read efforts in 11 state departments of education and expansion of the project to 31 states in fiscal 1973, supported by an additional $4.4 million. The aim of this project is to coordinate all reading and reading-related activities and resources within each state.
- Collection of effective reading programs and methods for evaluation and dissemination to all school districts in the country.
- Coordination of all federally funded reading programs and efforts to eliminate illiteracy in the United States.
- Involvement of the private sector in accomplishing Right To Read's goal of eliminating illiteracy.
- Providing technical assistance to various agencies of government which administer reading and related programs.
- Continuing to provide needs assessment and program planning instruments to local school districts.
- Establishing improved reading activities in colleges and universities.

WHAT WORKS?

Although there doesn't seem to be any single element that makes a compensatory education program successful, there are traits that most successful programs have in common. The generally agreed upon indicators of a successful program boil down to (1) student achievement, (2) student attendance, (3) positive self-concept and (4) physical needs met.

USOE's Division of Compensatory Education identified eight common characteristics of successful compensatory education programs by reviewing the following studies:

- Strategies of Compensation: A Review of Educational Projects for the Disadvantaged in the United States (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971)
- Compensatory Education: Evaluation in Perspective (Edmund W. Gordon, Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, 1970)
- How Effective Is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings (Final Report to the President's Commission on School Finance, Rand Corp., 1971)
- ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data from Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970 (American Institutes for Research, 1972)
- Draft, Final Report, Exemplary Projects Studies (Columbia U., 1972)
- State Title I Evaluation Reports for FY 1972

The eight common characteristics, warns USOE, "are not necessarily to be thought of as discrete categories." It expounds upon that cautionary note by adding:

> Each of the studies cited identified program characteristics associated with successful compensatory education programs. These characteristics were similar among reports which made a synthesis possible. While these are characteristics which are common to successful projects, we recognize that an overriding characteristic of a successful project is a committed, competent staff. A proper mix of common characteristics plus a committed, competent staff offers the greatest promise for a successful compensatory education program.

The eight "common characteristics" are the following:

Systematic planning which begins with formal policy decisions to increase support for quality compensatory programs. "These decisions are the basis for the necessary partnerships among board members, educators and parents as they plan the program's design, implementation and evaluation."

Clear objectives which must be clearly written and stated in specific measurable terms. Instructional techniques and materials must closely relate to those objectives.

Intensity of treatment which includes the amount of time the child spends in the program and the staff/pupil ratio within the classroom. Here, USOE cited the wide variance in the number of instructional hours per week in the programs studied (from three-fourths of an hour per day twice weekly to seven hours a day, five days a week). Likewise, the staff/pupil ratio varied from 1:1 to 1:15.

Attention to individual needs which includes a careful diagnosis and an individualized plan for each student.

Flexibility in grouping which allows staff opportunities to provide small group instruction and to teach frequently on a one-to-one basis. USOE notes that when group instruction was part of the daily program, it tended to be more effective if students were not confined to the same group for more than several days without reassessment of both the teachers' and students' strengths.

Personnel management which allows key staff personnel to work individually with teachers in the classroom. USOE stresses the need for much coordination and cooperation among staff members and a well designed inservice program.

Structured program approach which stresses sequential order and activities. Pupils must also receive frequent and immediate feedback.

Parental involvement which means the home must support what the child learns in school. Parents must also be committed to work as partners with school personnel and students.

The exemplary programs that follow indicate some of the other factors that contribute to success in children's achievement. Among the programs are five that were studied by American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences (AIR), Palo Alto, Calif. The studies have been updated for this Special Report with the help of personnel at each of the centers. Eleven other studies from the AIR report are presented in capsule form.

Also reported are Title I case studies, provided by USOE. The case studies serve best as "idea stimulators," and are not intended as models, says USOE's Division of Compensatory Education. As case studies, they show the weaknesses and the strengths of the projects. By focusing on the process rather than on the statistically validated end products, they show how Title I programs have been designed and implemented in a variety of settings. They offer helpful hints on the things that may fit into other Title I programs.

USOE warns, however, that no Title I program, no matter how exemplary, can be picked up with no modification by another district.

Finally, some capsulized reports on what is happening in various state compensatory education programs are presented.

The AIR Reports

The five AIR reports have been selected to provide some regional representation, age-level differences and other factors. Among all 16 programs, however, there are many similarities. Most of the programs focus on reading. Almost all stress individualized and small-group instruction and a small student-instructional staff ratio. In addition, all stress development of a positive self-image to improve student achievement.

Many of the programs provide inservice training for regular classroom teachers so they can continue the work done in special programs and classes. A few stress parent involvement, either as part-time or unpaid aides or as advisory council members to work with program staffs and directors.

The Juan Morel Campos Bilingual Center, Chicago

This bilingual center, located in a high-density, economically disadvantaged, Spanish-speaking section of Chicago, offers intermediate grade English and Spanish instruction to Spanish-speaking children.

The center's objectives are to develop the children's ability in listening, speaking, reading and writing English while strengthening literacy in their native Spanish; to improve their academic achievement in science, math, social studies; to impart an awareness and pride in their cultural heritage; and to integrate this heritage with that of the larger American society.

Past experience in the district indicated that school achievement of Spanish-speaking children tended to be low and that academic-social handicaps prevented the children from benefiting fully from the regular school experience. In addition, their high school (and even elementary) dropout rate was alarmingly high. The local high school district pressed for a special program that would help these youngsters catch up academically, motivate them to continue their education, and nurture pride in their heritage.

Thus, the Lafayette Bilingual Center (the center's original name) was set up to develop a special program for Spanish-speaking children who met the following criteria: 11 to 14 years of age; recent arrival to the U.S. mainland (most of the children in the program are Puerto Rican); apparently normal IQ; and no severe behavioral problems. The center began its operation in the fall of 1968 on one floor of the Lafayette Elementary School with a staff of 4 teachers and a student body of 45.

The 1969-70 budget for the center was $116,000. With 80 students (65 Spanish-speaking, 15 non-Spanish-speaking), the per-pupil cost was approximately $1,450. About 95% of the budget was used specifically for teacher salaries. The program at this point was receiving its funds from three sources: ESEA Title VII (46% of the program cost); ESEA Title I (38%); and the Chicago Board of Education (16%).

The center relocated in its own building in the fall of 1971 and changed its name to the Juan Morel Campos Bilingual Center. In addition to the Spanish-speaking children at the center, about 10 non-Spanish-speaking students (both

black and white) voluntarily enter the bilingual program each school year. They are instructed in their regular sixth- through eighth-grade curriculum, are taught Spanish, and act as English-speaking models for the Spanish children. Interaction between the two groups is encouraged through special bilingual conversation classes; integrated math, science and social studies classes; and frequent bicultural events.

The center has a staff of nine bilingual teachers (eight funded by the Chicago Board of Education and one by Title VII, ESEA), a clerk, two teachers aides and a school-community representative.

Spanish-speaking students, most of whom speak little English when they enter the school, follow an intensive English-as-a-second-language (ESL) program. Regular academic subjects are initially taught in Spanish; students switch to English gradually as their competency increases. The students are grouped by English proficiency levels rather than by age or grade. A student-teacher ratio of 10 or 12 to 1 makes individual and small-group instruction easier to attain. Particular emphasis is placed on diagnosing and meeting the learning problems of each child.

Initial instruction in English is primarily aural/oral since the philosophy at the center is that a grasp of the spoken idiomatic language is the only true beginning for language comprehension in a bilingual setting. To achieve its goal, the center's staff uses specially developed practice materials including drills and dialogs to make the necessary transition from spoken to written English as efficient as possible.

The first formal evaluation of the center's program was conducted during the 1969-70 school year. The primary objective was to determine the effect of the center on student aptitude, achievement and level of anxiety. Pretests were administered at the beginning of the school year and post-tests were conducted eight months later. The entire Spanish-speaking student body was given the tests, but due to attendance problems at the testing session, complete test data were not recorded for all 65 Spanish-speaking students. The non-Spanish-speaking students were not tested in this part of the program.

Evaluation plans called for a comparison of the center's test results to those of a comparable control group not attending the center. However, those plans were changed and the data concerned only students in the program whose results were then compared to national norms.

Phase 1 of the evaluation concerned the effect of the program on the students' aptitudes. Test scores tended to remain constant over repeated testings since gains in "achievement" on these tests tend to increase at the same rate as the maturation of the child being tested. It was concluded, however, that the center's program resulted in a statistically and educationally significant gain on the part of the participants.

The second phase of the evaluation focused on the measurement of achievement gains in the ability to (1) recognize printed English words, (2) discriminate between printed English words, (3) read and comprehend paragraphs in English, (4) spell English words, (5) use correct written English, and (6) solve arithmetic problems and understand arithmetic concepts expressed in English.

All of the test grade-equivalents were found to be statistically significant; i.e., the expected gain for the "average" student during the eight months between the pretests and post-tests indicated that students made educationally and statistically significant gains in almost all areas of concern.

The final phase of the evaluation program was concerned with testing the hypothesis that the students' experience in the center would tend to increase their drive to succeed. The tests indicated that the number of children who showed greater drive (anxiety) was greater than those whose anxiety level decreased, but the scores failed to show any statistical significance.

In terms of individual students, the success of the program seems evident. Follow-up visits with graduates attending high school have shown that (with two or three exceptions) all were interested in continuing their studies to achieve a high school diploma and were maintaining average or near-average grades.

Project MARS, Leominster, Mass.

Project MARS (Make All Reading Serviceable) offers special reading instruction to more than 200 public and parochial school disadvantaged children in grades 1-3 with follow-up being done on some fourth graders. The program's primary objective is to raise performance of students to a level consistent with their potential reading ability and thus avoid future problems. The program also aims to foster academic motivation and favorable attitudes toward school.

Title I funds are used to supplement the $900 per-pupil cost of the MARS program. Of that amount, $600 comes from the local school district and $300 from Title I. The cost of replicating the program, however, would vary from location to location depending on teacher salaries, the project's largest single expense.

There are five primary objectives in the program:

- To diagnose specific reading weaknesses and to provide individualized instruction in areas needing improvement.
- To strengthen and increase the reading performance of educationally deprived children.
- To give specific vocabulary practice.
- To help children acquire habits, attitudes and skills necessary to be successful in reading and schoolwork in general.
- To strengthen reading skills to enable disadvantaged children to perform on a level with their peers and maintain a positive self-image.

Children served by the program are located in seven schools in the target area--four public schools and three parochial schools. Each of the schools has a full-time remedial reading teacher. Students are admitted to the program on the basis of three criteria: (1) standardized reading test results, (2) daily classroom performance, and (3) the evaluations of teachers and prin-

cipals. Throughout the school year, pupils spend 45 minutes daily in the special reading classrooms. A student may be released from the program at any time during the school year when staff members, after consultations and record reviews, have determined that the child has reached his reading potential.

Project MARS was begun in 1966-67 in response to the needs of the area's disadvantaged children, who were falling below their grade levels in reading achievement. The program's methodology centers on intensive small-group instruction, emphasizing the use of materials and techniques other than those used in the regular classroom. This approach, program personnel feel, provides more appropriate instruction for children who have experienced only failure in the traditional classroom and with traditional classroom techniques.

The program's success stems from early diagnosis of potential reading problems and individualized and small-group instruction. Therefore, on the second day of school, every first grader is given a reading readiness test. Students whose test scores indicate that they might develop serious reading difficulties at a later time are automatically enrolled in the program.

Parents, too, are involved in the program through a 27-member parent advisory council. Parents are encouraged to visit the schools periodically and to attend conferences with school personnel.

At the end of the school year, teachers are required to submit detailed reports, anecdotal records and recommendations for the coming year. Teachers are also urged to be creative in selecting materials and designing techniques to sustain student interest and to create a positive attitude about success. Teachers participate in inservice team meetings and in a summer reading institute. They are required to do similar work every three years in order to keep abreast of new developments in reading instruction.

Instructional sessions are informal and the small-group instruction is designed to allow maximum opportunity for experimentation. Groups are composed of six or fewer children. No teacher in the remedial reading program has more than 30 children per day. Pupils suffering from severe reading problems are taught on a one-to-one basis in half-hour sessions.

The instruction period is divided into three parts: (1) skill development, (2) oral and silent reading, and (3) game time. Among the "special" activities employed which successfully stimulate student interest and provide instructional experiences different from those in the regular classroom is one that requires the pupils to "write books." The teacher types the original stories which are then bound.

Since the primary objective of the project is to provide remedial reading instruction to disadvantaged children in grades 1-3, program evaluation is based on the extent of reading achievement improvement after a full academic year of remedial reading instruction. The model used to evaluate the achievement gains is the standard pretest/post-test one. No control groups are employed; rather, students' performances are compared to national norms. During the 1969-70 academic year, reading achievement test scores indicated that Project MARS' second-, third- and fourth-grade students made gains which were both statistically and educationally significant.

Diagnostic Reading Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio

The Diagnostic Reading Clinic was first funded in 1966 under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity but was shifted to Title I during 1967. During the 1971-72 school year, 1,515 children participated in the program at a per-pupil cost of $404. Per-pupil costs included staff, instructional and consumable supplies, transportation, equipment and audiovisual supplies. In 1971-72, average gains for pupils treated in the program were 10.07 grade equivalent units for a 3 to 4 months' treatment.

The single most important element of the program for the pupil is concentrated attention to critical reading needs in an individualized and small-group setting (student-teacher ratio about 4 to 1), which removes the pressure of peer acceptance.

The clinic, two satellite clinics, and a follow-up clinicians program provide diagnostic and remedial services to children in grades 4-7. Both black and white children participate; the average age of the group is 11.

The clinic and the two satellite clinics provide short-, intermediate-, and long-range remediation for children whose reading problems are beyond the scope of regular classroom reading instruction. The follow-up clinicians are spread throughout the city's schools. They provide supportive reading assistance to students who have previously attended the clinic but who are making slow progress toward reading independence, as shown by post-clinic assessment.

Pupils in grades 4-7 are recommended to the clinic by teachers and principals in Title I schools on the basis of serious reading retardation. Children with severe behavioral problems or low test IQ's are assumed to be unable to benefit from the clinic program. The decision to focus on children in grades 4-7, rather than those in the lower elementary grades, was based on the assumption that younger children who read below grade level may simply need more maturation time to catch up with their peers. On the other hand, the developmental level of upper-elementary age children is presumed to be such that, by grade four, children reading one or two years below their grade level are likely to require special remediation.

The specific aims of the clinic are:

- To improve the reading skills of children with serious reading disabilities in an effort to bring them up to an appropriate level for their reading expectancy.
- To provide follow-up services for clinic pupils at their home schools in an effort to continue reading progress.
- To coordinate services of related disciplines in the diagnosis and correction of reading difficulties.
- To facilitate parental involvement and support in the remediation of pupils' reading disabilities.
- To provide consultation services to classroom teachers of referred pupils.

A variety of evaluation devices are used to achieve an objective analysis of each pupil's disability. Tested skills include word recognition, vocabulary, comprehension and oral reading. In addition, reading interests and attitudes are assessed. Other areas evaluated include auditory discrimination, visual-motor status, listening skills, scholastic aptitude and personal adjustment. Case study procedures are used to collect data about the child's home, school, and developmental and medical history.

Once the handicapping factors causing a child's reading disability are identified, an instructional plan is developed for each child by the clinic staff. In planning for each child's instruction, the characteristics of his growth and development are considered. The prescribed instructional materials and methods reflect the following characteristics:

- Highly individualized remedial treatment.
- Highly organized instructional plan.
- Concern for the child's need to feel successful.
- Provision for articulation and follow-up with the child's regular classroom so that reading progress can be maintained and strengthened.

Remedial sessions are held in about 10 classrooms in the clinic. In each class there are two clinicians and about 10 children. Although clinicians view children as individuals, they recognize the need of a disabled reader to share reading experiences with other children who are overcoming similar difficulties. Thus, during the hour at the clinic, the child might be grouped with a small number of children whose needs, strengths and disabilities are similar to his own. The clinician-pupil ratio for group instruction can be 1 to 8. The more frequent ratio is one clinician to four pupils.

In-depth diagnosis of pupils referred by the schools is conducted by a team consisting of a reading clinician, psychologist, nurse and speech-hearing specialist. Based on the results of diagnostic screening, a highly organized instructional plan--consisting of carefully selected techniques, procedures and materials--is written for each child by the remediation team. The child receives his individually prescribed remediation from a certified reading clinician for one hour a day, five days a week, for his prescribed term.

The ultimate objective of the clinic is to enable the child to benefit from regular classroom reading instruction upon completion of his remediation term. Children who test within a year of their reading expectancy level are released from the clinic and provided with follow-up service by special consultants who use various incentives to encourage maintenance and improvement of reading skills. Inservice training, provision and interpretation of diagnostic and remedial information, and consultative assistance on a request basis are additional services the clinic provides for its feeder schools. Parent involvement is also an important component of the clinic program.

During the 1969-70 school year, the clinic diagnosed about 730 pupils and remediated 532 of them. Evaluation of the 1969-70 program was based mainly on reading achievement gains of a random sample of 62 students (42 boys and 20 girls) with a grade-level distribution corresponding to that of the entire clinic population. Regardless of length of treatment, all gains were found to be statistically significant. Moreover, the educational significance of those

gains was confirmed by the fact that each of the three service groups (short-, intermediate- or long-term remediation) made greater gain than the expected gain for "average" readers. Comparison of gains across service groups indicated that intermediate-term readers had the greatest rate of gain in both comprehension and vocabulary. Teacher perceptions of the participants' classroom behavior and parents' reports of their children's home behavior were positive.

At the end of the year, classroom teachers were asked to rate clinic participants' reading performance and behavior in the classroom. In terms of use of reading materials in the classrooms, the teachers rated 35% of the students as being able to handle classroom reading materials "always" or "most of the time," 54% of the students rated "sometimes" and 11%, "rarely."

Classroom teachers also rated the classroom behavior of the clinic's participants at the end of the school year in terms of participation in class, written assignments, self-confidence, rapport with classmates and attitude toward school. Approximately 80% of the students showed "some" to "very much" improvement in each of the behavior areas rated. Classroom teachers reported that the clinic's participants made the greatest improvement in (1) mastery of word analysis skills, (2) knowledge of sight words, (3) motivation to master reading, (4) self-confidence and (5) comprehension.

A parent questionnaire was sent to the home of each clinic participant. On the basis of a 60% return, it was concluded that the child's home behavior, too, had substantially changed. Eighty per cent of the parents responding reported that their children enjoyed reading more, took more books home from the library and read more at home; 52% stated that their children enjoyed attending the clinic. The parents were unanimous in recommending that clinic services be continued.

Remedial Reading Laboratories, El Paso, Tex.

The Remedial Reading Laboratories program was designed to improve the reading achievement of disadvantaged students in grades 4-12 and thereby enable them to benefit from regular classroom instruction. The program also aims at improving the students' self-confidence and self-esteem. Supported by Title I funds, the program serves pupils from poverty areas within the city of El Paso. A majority of the target population is Mexican-American and the children's language difficulties compound and complicate their reading problems.

The program has three distinguishing components:

- Special selection and scheduling procedures.
- Systematic instructional planning.
- Individualized instruction.

Special selection and scheduling procedures

Pupils are selected for the program by a two-phase process. The first phase is a general screening based on classroom teacher referrals. Using a form provided by the school district, teachers compare the students' reading scores to their mathematics scores. High IQ scores are taken into consideration; low IQ scores are not.

The second phase of pupil selection includes a more refined screening. Pupils are ranked by an index which is designed to compare the student's reading achievement in relation to his IQ. Another test measures reading achievement in relation to mathematics achievement to provide a fairer estimate of a child's ability in cases of extreme language disability.

Once selected, the students are given individual diagnostic tests to determine their specific learning disabilities and to aid in scheduling classes. Different methods of scheduling pupils for remedial reading are chosen by the principals in the various schools, depending on their individual scheduling situation. In general, students are grouped into classes by one of two methods--selection by grade levels, or grouping according to specific reading disabilities. Within each class, instructional activities are individualized, and considerable time is spent on practice and reinforcement of newly acquired skills. These skills are constantly reevaluated and used as a basis for regrouping.

Systematic instructional planning — In planning remedial instruction, teachers are urged to use the following guidelines:

- Effective reading instruction depends on thorough and continual diagnosis of individual proficiencies and deficiencies through both testing and informal analysis.
- Instruction is based on the profile of skills revealed by the diagnosis and is adjusted in response to the pupil's progress.
- Materials are sufficiently difficult to challenge the pupil, but sufficiently easy to insure his success.
- Little or no pressure from teachers and parents is brought to bear on the pupil.
- The criterion of skill mastery, rather than pupil's grade placement, governs the substance, pace and direction of instruction.
- Individual assistance and personal encouragement are readily available to each pupil.
- No teacher is limited to a narrow range of materials or techniques.

Individualized instruction — The major components of the instructional program are individualized diagnosis and prescriptive instruction, small class size and varied instructional materials. Typical class sessions make use of frequently changing activities, at least three activities per session. For example, one such activity is a game designed to help children recognize and understand the formation of compound words. Working with cards on which the teacher has printed simple words, the children put two cards together to form compound words.

In addition to special classrooms in each school which are designated as reading laboratories, a special 11-room reading center was constructed

on one high school campus. The center provides a site for intensive inservice training sessions designed to give all reading lab teachers a thorough knowledge of specialized work in the field of reading. The center has classroom facilities where 150 pupils from Bowie Junior-Senior High School are given remedial instruction one hour a day. An adjacent room has one-way mirrors so teachers may observe remedial reading techniques. The center also operates as a testing ground for new materials.

Program costs over the seven-year period (1965-72) averaged $178 per pupil. In 1971-72, the average cost per pupil amounted to $270. Thirteen new labs were added during the school year. Without this expansion, the cost per student would be about $200, according to Mrs. Edna Steirnagle, Title I consultant for the program.

On the basis of six years of evaluation data, children attending the remedial reading laboratories have generally made more than twice the reading achievement gains they made during their previous school years. Further, the educational significance of those gains has been demonstrated for five consecutive years when different achievement tests have been employed. Finally, when the statistical data were tested, the gains were found to be statistically as well as educationally significant.

Each year students completing the remedial reading laboratories program are rated by their classroom teachers in regard to their work habits, personal adaptability, interest and social habits in the classroom. Teachers are asked to rate the students on a five-point scale ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. The sample sizes were approximately 107 students each year. More than 80% of those students rated at the end of 1967-68 and 1968-69 were given a rating of average or above average for all four categories.

A similar rating of students was conducted during the 1969-70 school year. However, unlike the two previous ratings, these students were rated prior to entry into the remedial reading program and again after the program was completed. This practice has since become standard procedure. There has been a considerable increase in the percentage of students given above average and excellent ratings after they have completed the program.

On the basis of the teacher rating data, it appears that the remedial reading experience received by the children resulted in some improvement in their self-confidence which manifested itself in improved personal and social behavior.

From the group of students that completed the remedial reading program during 1967-68, 180 students were randomly selected in 1968-69 for a four-year follow-up study. The follow-up students fell into three categories:

- Category 1--students reading at normal grade level in May 1968 who made three or more years' gain in reading achievement during 1967-68.
- Category 2--students reading at grade level in May 1968 who made less than three years' gain in reading achievement during 1967-68.
- Category 3--students reading at grade level in May 1968 who made at least three years' gain in reading achievement during 1967-68.

During December 1968, the students' teachers were asked to rate the students' classroom adjustment in terms of a three-point scale (good, borderline, poor). Analysis of the rating data indicated that 90% of the students in category 1 and more than 80% of the students in the other two categories were considered by their teachers to be well adjusted to school. Only 3% of the students were considered to have school adjustment problems. For the final year of the study (1971-72), all remaining students were rated "well adjusted." (Only one student dropped out of the program. The others who left did so because their families moved.)

Reading, mathematics and social studies grades for the first marking period were also analyzed for the 180 students in the follow-up program. During the first year, the students in categories 1 and 2 had an average grade in all three subjects of above C, while the mean grade for those students in category 3 was C in mathematics and slightly below C in the other two subjects.

On the basis of this follow-up and three years of additional follow-up, it was concluded that a large percentage of students from the 1967-68 remedial studies group has continued to retain the ability to cope with grade-level subject matter and has improved attitudes toward self, school and society. Of the eight students who have graduated from high school, four are attending college; one was valedictorian of her class; one scored 1,100 on his SAT.

Project Early Push, Buffalo, N.Y.

Project Early Push is a Title I-funded preschool education program serving 980 disadvantaged 4-year-olds at an annual per-pupil cost of about $550. In operation since 1966, the program is designed to provide experiences which are basic to later reading success and which are usually missing in traditional disadvantaged preschool environments. Seventeen schools were involved in the program during the 1967-68 school year, but this was increased to 22 schools during 1970-71. For 1972-73, the program still operated in 22 schools.

The overall goal of Project Early Push is to bridge the gap between the culturally different environments of the children and the requirements of the school experiences they will encounter in the primary grade classroom. Twelve specific objectives were identified as necessary components of this goal:

- Nurturing a healthy self-concept.
- Improving perceptual, discriminatory, labeling and concept-building abilities.
- Enlarging understanding of the environment.
- Enlarging self-expression.
- Developing body coordination.
- Encouraging interaction with others.
- Stimulating verbal communication.
- Providing meaningful experiences with literature.
- Developing auditory discrimination and appreciation.
- Encouraging appreciation of a well ordered environment.
- Gaining the interest, support and involvement of parents in the progress and welfare of their children.
- Improving teacher and lay understanding of culturally deprived children.

The distinguishing characteristics of Project Early Push include:

- Small, well equipped classrooms arranged into several interest centers.
- A relatively unstructured curriculum.
- An extensive schedule of field trips.
- Intensive parental participation.
- Regularly scheduled inservice training.

Each Early Push class is composed of approximately 15 children who are taught by a qualified teacher and community aide. Classes are well equipped with furniture, housekeeping items, musical instruments, audiovisual materials, locomotor toys, woodworking equipment and science materials. Instructional materials and equipment are arranged into interest centers which are periodically rearranged to correspond to current thematic units.

During the first and longest period of the day, children are free to select from the centers those materials and activities that interest them most. The teacher's role during this free activity is to help children capitalize on each potential learning experience. After this initial period, which lasts up to two hours, children are provided a snack prepared by the teacher and aide with the assistance of the children. Then the children participate in one or more group activities for the remainder of the class time. Group activities include discussions, rhythmic and music activities, group games and listening to stories. In addition to classroom activities, the children are taken on many field trips designed to broaden their experiences and interest.

Parents are encouraged to make classroom visits and to participate in classroom activities. Two teacher-parent conferences and two parent-teacher workshops are scheduled each year. A volunteer parent council meets three times a year to discuss new directions and make recommendations for program improvement. Monthly, the program publishes a parent newspaper. Teachers and aides attend an average of two inservice meetings per month.

A random sample of the children during the 1968-69 academic year showed a mean IQ gain of 5.7 points on the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence. The gain was found to be statistically significant. Full-scale score gains and most sub-scale gains on a shortened version of the Wechsler test were found statistically significant at the end of the 1969-70 school year. Similar though somewhat larger gains were reported each year on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; however, since teachers themselves did the test, the evaluator suggested that results be interpreted cautiously.

On the basis of the above data, it appears that Project Early Push is a continued success. Each academic year since 1967-68, the children in the program have made intelligence test gains that have been found to be statistically significant. According to Joan C. Downey, project administrator of special programs in early childhood education for the Buffalo, N.Y., schools, pretest and post-test scores continue to indicate that children show growth beyond expectations. An added benefit is minimum staff turnover.

Other Exemplary Programs Cited by AIR

Following are capsules of 11 other exemplary programs selected for study by AIR.

1. College Bound Program, New York City: A program of intensified instruction in English and mathematics for college preparation involving 250 students in 31 schools in grades 9-12. Special features include double English period, cultural enrichment, and regular and summer sessions.

2. Learning To Learn Program, Jacksonville, Fla.: Forty preschool and lower primary grade children learn through manipulation, exploration and experimentation. Program emphasizes conversation and social interaction, deemphasizes teacher participation and stresses active parent participation through an education program.

3. Higher Horizons 100, Hartford, Conn.: Funded under the Connecticut State Act for Disadvantaged Children since 1965, the program offers 100 students a language remediation program in special ninth-grade classes for one year, after which students enter regular tenth-grade classes.

4. More Effective Schools (MES), New York City: Initiated in 1964, MES was designed by the American Federation of Teachers to prevent academic failure of disadvantaged urban children. MES focused on reading and mathematics problems. During 1970-71, the program involved 27,000 students in 27 schools. With AFT push, MES has started to spread across the country (i.e., local school funds are not available to maintain the low student-teacher ratio or provide supplementary services).

5. Mother-Child Home Program, Freeport, N.Y.: A program offering home enrichment via paraprofessionals and a stimulation kit to help low-income families foster their children's cognitive growth.

6. Preschool Program, Fresno, Calif.: Partially funded by Title I, this program offers 750 preschoolers in 19 schools instruction to develop language, cognitive, motor and social skills. The program also provides health services, and has an active parent advisory council. The child-adult ratio is 5 to 1.

7. Project Conquest, East St. Louis, Ill.: A remedial reading program started in 1965, Project Conquest is now funded by Title I. It serves up to 2,000 elementary school children. The program has three basic objectives: (1) to raise the reading ability of able disadvantaged children so they can function in regular classrooms, (2) to improve students' self-concept and academic aspirations, and (3) to train regular classroom teachers in remedial reading techniques.

8. Project R-3, San Jose, Calif.: This is a special mathematics and reading program operated in cooperation with the education division of Lockheed Missiles. It serves 240 ninth graders (students begin the program while in seventh grade) and demonstrates the relevance of classroom learning to real world problems. The goal of the R-3 program is to build academic motivation.

9. PS 115 Alpha One Reading Program, New York City: A first-grade reading program, Alpha One was introduced in 1969 to one first-grade class (27 pupils) in order to compare learning results to a control group using a regular reading program. Alpha One uses a game-like approach to learning. Tests administered during the second grade indicated Alpha One graduates were reading at fourth-grade level.

10. Fernald School Remediation of Learning Program, Los Angeles, Calif.: Operating as a facility of the psychology department of the U. of California at Los Angeles, the school offers remediation to about 80 children in grades 2-11 who are at least 1.5 years behind in basic skills. The program uses individualized instruction, a low student-teacher ratio and a special school environment to bolster achievement.

11. Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wis.: This program offers remedial reading instruction to 2,220 educationally disadvantaged children in grades 2-8 at 36 Title I-funded centers. The per-pupil cost during 1969-70 was $200 to $250 above the base per-pupil cost for the whole district. Instruction is in small, nongraded groups or individualized, depending on the needs of each child.

TITLE I CASE STUDIES

USOE's Division of Compensatory Education (DCE) considers the Case Studies listed below as "idea stimulators"--not as models. They should be viewed for their value as helpful hints for other programs. No program, no matter how exemplary, DCE officials say, can be picked up with no modification by another district.

The Title I Case Studies will be presented in somewhat capsulized form trying to offer the who, what, how many, how much. For copies of the studies, write to: Program Support Branch, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, ROB #3, Room 3653-G, 7th & D St. SW, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Bilingual Program, Tucumari, N.M.

The bilingual program at Zia Elementary School is an attempt to improve the educational opportunity and the overall school experience of approximately 162 educationally deprived children. The program, which began in 1969-70 by serving a single pre-first grade, expanded its service to cover all children through grade two and one third-grade class. The per-pupil cost is $377.

The program seeks to:

- Develop literacy skills in both the children's mother tongue and the second language.
- Provide bilingual instruction in social studies and cultural enrichment.
- Assist the development of a positive self-image and cultural identity.

A bilingual staff, consisting of three teachers and four aides, provides instructional activities during daily visits to all regular classrooms in

grades 1-3. Children are grouped, according to ability, for half-hour morning sessions in reading both Spanish and English. In the afternoon, the bilingual teachers return to the regular classroom to provide a one-hour instruction period in Spanish, social studies and cultural enrichment. Parents of the children sponsor additional special activities and presentations to reinforce the cultural identity and self-image of the Spanish-speaking children.

Until the program proved successful, Tucumari, like other schools in the Southwest, had pre-first grade classes for all children entering school. Under the arrangement, a child could progress from pre-first grade to second grade if his English-speaking ability and academic achievement warranted the jump. If, however, a child was having difficulty with English, he would progress to first grade. The success of the bilingual program in Tucumari has led to the elimination of the pre-first grade concept throughout the whole district. Other positive indicators that the program has had significant impact are:

- The number of children who progressed from pre-first grade directly into second grade increased markedly. In 1968-69, the first-grade retention rate was 36%. After one year, the percentage dropped to about 16%.
- As a result of the decreased retention, all pre-first grades were eliminated except for one class of eight children. School officials were optimistic that this class, too, will be eliminated.
- Absenteeism and vandalism to school property were reduced sharply.
- Parental involvement in the total school program increased markedly.

Spanish English Developmental Program, Buffalo, N.Y.

Buffalo's bilingual education program began in January 1970 with funds from New York's Urban Education Act. In August 1970, Title I funds were allocated to cover the cost per pupil of $226. Nearly 1,600 students of Spanish origin in nine schools (three elementary, four elementary-secondary, and two secondary schools) take part in the program.

All staff members, including 12 teachers, 33 aides, a social worker and a guidance counselor, are fluent in both English and Spanish. An orientation course in Puerto Rican culture and history is offered at all Title I schools by a floating teacher/aide team. And plans call for the implementation of a full-year course in Puerto Rican culture and history at the secondary level.

Continuous Progress Program, Williamsburg County, S.C.

This early childhood education program in a desegregated school district is attempting to improve the achievement levels of K-4 students in 12 schools. The concentration is on reading and mathematics instruction. The program began in 1968-69 as a kindergarten project and was so successful that it evolved into a continuous progress program in the primary grades. The cost per pupil is $377. The program involves 25 kindergarten teachers, 100 teachers in grades 1-4, 20 administrators and 100 teacher aides.

Teacher training was an important component of the program, both because a number of the county's teachers did not have college degrees and because the

county was changing its emphasis from traditional, graded classrooms to skills development centers supervised by teams of teachers and aides.

Classroom instruction occurs under a team-teaching approach. Classrooms are arranged in centers, with each center having several work areas and materials and equipment appropriate for the skill being developed. In the first years of the program, instructional concentration was on reading and mathematics. In 1971-72 it was expanded to include other areas. The county hired part-time consultant trainers in science, music, physical education, English as a second language, and child guidance to assist classroom teachers in improving their instructional techniques.

Replication of Bilingual Project, Albuquerque, N.M.

In 1969-70, some 270 students in kindergarten and first grade in Coronado Elementary School took part in a Title VII bilingual education pilot project. The program has been expanded to nine Title I elementary schools at a cost of $69.87 per pupil. The expanded program was entirely funded with Title I carryover money and a special grant under part C of Title I.

The major objectives of the bilingual program are to help children achieve academic success (including literacy in both English and Spanish), improve their self-image, retain and develop their native language and culture, and gain fluency in a second language and an understanding and appreciation for a second culture.

A major component of the pilot project (it has since been carried into the other schools) was the development of a totally bilingual curriculum. Working in committees, and with the aid of Title VII personnel, teachers developed audiovisual aids, adapted stories and songs into Spanish, reviewed existing materials in both languages, and wrote comprehensive curriculum guides, including sample lesson plans.

Liaison Teacher Returnee Counselor Project, Milwaukee

This program assists delinquent teen-agers in three correctional institutions (two schools for boys and one for girls) prepare to readjust to high school. The annual cost per pupil is $659 in Title I funds plus $20 in regular counseling costs. The program operates under two separate Title I proposals, one by the Wisconsin State Dept. of Education, which administers correctional institutions, the other by the Milwaukee Public Schools.

Designed to provide continuous support to delinquent juveniles after their release from state institutions, the project uses former teachers from the institutions and special counselors in four Milwaukee high schools to help the teen-agers readjust to the regular school system. Students make the transition from institution to school in three steps:

1. Prerelease activities.
2. Programming and orientation after release.
3. Continued supportive counseling.

The returnee counselors representing the four participating high schools are responsible for helping the returnee fit into the school curriculum, often in the middle of the term. Liaison teachers provide personal observations that can be useful in scheduling. And each case is treated individually--one student may be assigned to a work-release program while another may get a full academic schedule.

In the first year of the project (1969-70), three liaison teachers and two returnee counselors served about 100 teen-agers at two high schools. By 1971 there were four liaison teachers, two paraprofessionals and four returnee counselors working with more than 200 teen-agers at four high schools.

Pyramids Reading Program, Minneapolis

This program aims at prevention and remediation of reading disabilities of disadvantaged children in two of the school district's "pyramids" (groups of geographically related schools). Funded under Title I, the program is part of a larger program which Minneapolis calls "Instruction in Basic Skills for Educationally Deprived Children." The program emphasizes four activities:

- Training for teachers and teacher aides.
- An instructional materials center for development of supplementary classroom materials.
- Actual classroom instruction.
- Summer school.

The program actually got its start when the need for upgrading students' reading was identified as the major educational problem in two areas of the city. In the 40 schools (public and nonpublic, elementary and secondary) located in areas eligible for Title I services, one-third of the 20,000 children attending these schools in 1971-72 were classified as educationally disadvantaged by the Minnesota State Dept. of Education. A student was so classified if he was one or more grade levels behind in basic skills such as reading and arithmetic or below the 25th percentile at his grade level.

One factor identified as contributing to underachievement by students in the target areas was their high mobility rate, which meant that the student had to adjust to a different reading system with each move. The school district thus decided to establish a uniform reading program in the pyramids areas, concentrate on the primary grade levels and establish a remedial aspect for students in grades 4-6 who did not have primary reading skills.

The inservice training course for teachers, initiated in 1968 and now offered for all pyramids teachers, aides and other personnel, concentrates on:

- Demonstration of effective instructional techniques for teaching disadvantaged children to read.
- Laboratory experience in diagnosing reading disabilities, analyzing the reading level of the whole class and grouping students within the class.
- Classroom methods and materials for treating specific reading difficulties and development of supplementary materials by small groups of teachers.
- Classroom methods for helping children with severe reading disabilities.

In addition to the training programs for teachers and aides, students from the U. of Minnesota are given an opportunity to combine their course work with an internship in the pyramids program.

The instructional materials center serves as a distributing and storage unit for all materials used in the program. In addition, the center's director, reading specialist and resource teachers coordinate staff development and workshops, visit target area classrooms, demonstrate techniques and materials. A print shop housed in the center prints materials requested and developed by teachers and reading specialists. During 1971-72, the staff also developed a methods bank with videotape and cassette recordings of various training components of the program.

In the classroom, the pyramids program emphasizes sound-symbol relationships and spelling patterns. To compensate for the variation in dialects of many of the students, the language program at the prekindergarten and kindergarten level concentrates on an oral or aural approach to reading and reading

USOE Cites Compensatory 'Payoffs'

USOE's Division of Compensatory Education cites the following results of successful compensatory education programs funded by Title I. Along with 15 others, the programs were chosen as award winners and were on exhibit at the 1973 Ed Fair, sponsored by USOE.

Details on all programs, including 13 Title III projects, 1 Follow Through project and 1 Title VII project appear on p.

Wichita, Kan.: 58% of 888 pupils tested gained at least one month per month in reading vocabulary.

Linden, N.J.: 78 kindergartners averaged two months per month gain in reading readiness.

Bessemer, Ala.: 60% of the students enrolled in a preschool program scored above the 50th percentile in reading readiness as opposed to 17% originally.

Thomson, Ga.: 104 students in grades 7-9 made a mean gain of 1.3 years in reading; 15% gained from 2.5 to 4 years.

Portland, Ore.: 71% of tested high school students showed gains of from 2 to 10 grade level years.

Newport Beach, Calif.: 285 children in grades 4-8 achieved a mean gain range by grade of 1.8 to 2.1 in language arts and 1.6 to 3.2 in math.

Northglenn, Colo.: 172 students in grades 7 and 8 made an average gain of 1.15 years in reading.

Flagstaff, Ariz.: 679 students, grades 2-12, averaged a gain of 1.1 in vocabulary and 1.4 in comprehension.

Newport, R.I.: 173 seventh and eighth graders gained 1.0 year or more in reading.

Oglala, S.D.: 50% of 59 children in Loneman (BIA) Day School gained 1.0 years or more in math; 50 students in grades 4-6 gained 0.9 year in reading.

readiness. Games, flannelboard stories, puppets and a variety of manipulative materials are used to facilitate learning. Instruction in the primary grades also makes use of visual, auditory and kinesthetic methods. Oral reading, including the repetition of materials used by the teacher, pupil or on a tape, is an important part of the daily lesson. The staffing pattern of individual schools is flexible, although team teaching and small group instruction are encouraged.

In summer school classes, teachers aim at helping students maintain the skills they have developed during the regular school year. Teachers particularly try to reinforce the vocabulary and concepts of each student who attends the summer school.

STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION RESULTS

Each year, under Title I regulations, every state must submit a report evaluating its Title I efforts. Following are summaries of Title I reports for several states, plus reports from two states (Michigan and New York) reporting success as a result of state compensatory efforts. Some of the reports detail elements that lead to success; others make recommendations based on their findings.

California

During 1971-72, California Title I programs served 314,281 children (from preschool through ungraded) in both public and nonpublic schools (96.7% of the children served were in public schools), in 560 districts. Students selected for participation in Title I programs had an academic achievement of 0.7 year's growth or less for each year in school. Some of the elements in the programs designed to promote students' success were:

- An expenditure of at least $300 per child.
- Inclusion of six components in all programs: language development, mathematics, auxiliary services, parent involvement, intergroup relations and staff development.
- Performance objectives established for each of the six components.
- Special consideration of pupils in elementary school grades.
- Diagnostic-prescriptive techniques in the language-development component.

Following are some of the general findings regarding the six components:

Language Development--Title I students at all grade levels, on an average, attained greater than one month's growth in reading skills for each month of instruction. Districts offering English as a second language reported their objectives are achieved more often when locally developed instructional materials are used with individualized instruction. The use of commercial materials and large-group instruction rarely worked as well.

Mathematics--Successful projects (where student gains were equal to or more than one month's growth for each month's participation) frequently used individualized instruction methods, diagnostic and prescriptive procedures, and motivation and content-oriented materials.

Auxiliary Services--By supplying supportive pupil personnel services, library services and health services, major gains included improvements in pupil behavior, learning and personal health.

Parent Involvement--This component usually results in improved attendance at school meetings and parent conferences, better attitudes toward the school, and increased communication and cooperation between home and school.

Intergroup Relations--Objectives included greater understanding and acceptance, knowledge, interaction and positive attitudes, leading to reduced isolation between different racial, social, cultural or ethnic groups.

Staff Development--Emphasis was placed on training personnel who worked directly with students. Objectives emphasized improved instruction, changes in staff attitudes and increased knowledge of the learning process.

Michigan

Michigan's success story in compensatory education is due to a state "comp ed" project, in addition to the federally funded Title I program. Reaching 112,000 elementary school children who rank in the bottom 16th percentile in math and reading in 67 districts, the state's $22.5 million "accountability model" seems to be reaching the students. Under the program, schools establish performance objectives representing at least one grade level gain for participating students. State Supt. John W. Porter calls it a "performance pact" with the schools. If each student achieves at least 75% of the specified objectives, the school district receives a full $200 per-pupil grant in following years.

First results from 36 of the 67 participating districts show that 93% of the students in the math program achieved 75% or more of the objectives as did 73% of those in the reading program and 63% of those in both programs.

Porter says Michigan is succeeding because the burden for success has been shifted from the student to the instructional program. "We have told the schools to spell out what they want to happen and have held them accountable for achieving it," Porter says. Charles Blaschke of Education Turnkey Systems, which has provided technical assistance to Michigan and the 67 districts, says the difference is in how the money is being spent. On the average, districts have spent 34% of the funds for materials and equipment. The usual figure is 10% spent under Title I, ESEA, according to Blaschke.

The program has had a spin-off effect on the state's Title I projects. Federally funded compensatory education programs in Michigan have reported average student gains of 1.3 months for every month of instruction in reading and math. The reason: many of the students in the federal compensatory education programs are also participating in the state program.

Connecticut

Ninety programs in Connecticut's compensatory education program were identified in 1971-72 as effective efforts in helping educationally deprived children. Most of the programs involved reading, but math, language and preschool programs have also been cited.

Test gains in reading and mathematics for all compensatory efforts in the state equaled or exceeded a rate of one year's achievement for one year's participation.

Connecticut also gathered data on 1,896 children who received services in 1970-71 compensatory education programs. When the interval between testing extended over a two-year period, achievement gains appeared to be much closer to just under a year's growth per year for disadvantaged children.

The two-year study clarified the following points:

1. Reading deficits for disadvantaged pupils who were not getting special help increased at a consistent rate up through the grades.

2. Reading deficits of disadvantaged children receiving compensatory help decreased by about one-third to one-half.

3. Reading deficits decreased about the same regardless of pupils' grade level, except for pupils in grade two.

What Texas Has Learned

According to Texas' Title I report for 1971-72, two big problem areas in compensatory education programs are the need for intensive treatment for longer periods and/or increased emphasis on students at the prekindergarten and kindergarten levels.

Test data indicate that beginning in the second grade, pupils were achieving below their grade level even though substantial gains were being shown. "From these data," the Texas report says, "it appears the problem is not the absence of growth by pupils who received special treatment, but the fact that this growth is not substantial enough to keep these pupils from falling further behind each year in relation to their grade placement. This might be an indication of a need to continue activities provided at the preschool level to sustain the benefits which can be realized from intensive treatment at the early levels, or that greater emphasis should be placed on pupils at the prekindergarten and kindergarten levels where earlier impacts could be realized."

The Texas report also notes the problem of the over-age underachiever as a cause of school dropouts. By the fourth-grade level, the report says, approximately 11% of all the disadvantaged children were already over-age for their grade level and the percentage of over-age children continued to grow at each subsequent grade level.

4. Deficits in reading of pupils in the second grade did not increase over a two-year period.

5. Where pupils were not provided compensatory education services for a second year, test results indicated that students should have been provided the services. Their later achievement indicated they needed the support to maintain their growth.

Based on its findings, Connecticut made the following recommendations:

...The major compensatory efforts of a school district should be directed toward pupils in the early grades and preschool programs, and once the pupils have been identified, services or checks on their progress should follow them through the early grades rather than the introduction of services to other new pupils in need of help. The follow-up evidence indicates that more than 50% of the pupils getting a first year of services are not continued in compensatory programs even though their achievement test results a year later indicate their continued need for such services.

New York

The 1971-72 annual evaluation report of New York State's Urban Education program revealed significant gains in academic achievement for participating students, particularly in reading and math.

At a cost of $47 million for the 1971-72 school year, 297 specialized projects in 30 of the state's largest cities provided educational assistance to 500,000 participants, many of whom were enrolled in more than one program. Twenty-five per cent of the total expenditure went to projects in reading and math aimed at individualizing instruction and providing remedial work.

In comparison to a previous achievement level of .62 month for each month of activity, the rate of achievement for students participating in special reading projects was .99 month for each month of activity. Achievement of students in the special math programs was even higher. Although pupils with special needs related to poverty had normally performed at the rate of .56 month per month of activity, disadvantaged children in urban education districts during 1971-72 achieved at the rate of 1.76 month for each month of activity. "It is clear that in both reading and mathematics," said New York Comr. of Education Ewald B. Nyquist, "the special funding has provided a rate of gain in achievement that consistently exceeds the historical rate achieved by similar students without special help."

The urban education funding seems to be making an impact on students beyond those directly served, according to Nyquist. Over 50% of the projects listed as exemplary in the previous year's report (1970-71) were incorporated in whole or in part into the regular program of the participating districts.

In testimony before the House subcommittee on Labor/HEW appropriations in May 1973, Nyquist also supported increased allocations for Title I, ESEA, by citing the effects of the federal program in his state. He reported on a

Compensatory Education: Whose Responsibility?

If the federal government cannot or, as some argue, should not be held totally responsible for the educational and related social problems of the disadvantaged, then who can? The question may be rhetorical since education is traditionally a state responsibility.

Some argue that the states and local districts should share more of the burden of providing for the disadvantaged residing within their borders. The counter argument of course is that many states and local districts are also hard pressed for money or have all they can do to meet current needs.

Yet, as the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) pointed out in its 1973 annual report, "local school districts and states cannot afford the magnitude of the cost of educating children who need more services as a result of educational neglect and whose families are not of sufficient income to overcome the tax share for the cost of that need."

How much money do the states specifically spend for compensatory education? According to NACEDC, only 14 state budgets include funds for compensatory education and the total for the 14 hovers around $150 million per year. The breakdown is as follows:

State	1972	1973
Arizona	$ 100,000	$ 100,000
California	28,500,000	28,500,000
Colorado	1,500,000	1,000,000
Connecticut	6,000,000	7,000,000
Delaware	500,000	-0-
Hawaii	1,411,143	1,389,089
Michigan	22,500,000	22,500,000
New York	52,000,000	47,000,000
Ohio	28,745,142	33,337,400
Oregon	300,000	300,000
Pennsylvania	1,000,000	1,187,909
Rhode Island	2,000,000	2,000,000
Washington	4,000,000	4,000,000
Wisconsin	4,000,000*	*
	$152,556,285	$148,314,398

*Two-year appropriation for compensatory education program in Milwaukee

case study of more than 58,000 pupils in the state--all of whom achieved far more than expected through compensatory education. Upon entering Title I programs, he said, 45,000 elementary school pupils were achieving one-third of a year more than expected. And, he reported, statistics for about 5,000 secondary school pupils showed a threefold increase in reading achievement from Title I, with equally large gains in both elementary and high school math.

Ohio

The evaluation report on Title I programs in the state of Ohio had a slightly different twist than many of the reports submitted to USOE's Division of Compensatory Education. In addition to the usual information on expenditures, student-teacher ratio, inservice training, nonpublic school participation, parent involvement, the report contained three "success stories" which focused on what happens to kids as a result of Title I. (In another part of the Title I report, Ohio stated that in 77% of the classes where standardized tests were used as a measurement, participants engaged in reading and language arts programs gained from 0.6 to more than 1.5 years' growth.) The "kids' success stories" follow:

> At the beginning of the school year, Harold, a second grade student, came into the reading lab every day and would not utter a word, even when he was asked questions.... It took much time and effort, but I eventually got him to respond, although he only spoke a few words each day. His reading was quite poor--he scored a 1.0 grade level on the California Reading Test in September (his was the lowest score in his section). Throughout the year, Harold learned to participate more fully in the reading program. Language arts activities, such as dramatic interpretation, oral expression, films, the use of audiovisual equipment and stories helped him to gain confidence in himself.... His increase of seven months is only a beginning for him; he will probably increase more each year throughout his school years if he receives the same or some similar treatment.
>
> A major success of this year's program has been the little girl who will enter third grade this fall. When she was received into our program in the fall of 1971 she was a retained first grader. In only nine months' time...she was able to complete all of her first-grade work and all of her second-grade work and is excitedly waiting to enter third grade next week.
>
> Debbie's classroom teacher came to me the middle of October and asked if I would give Debbie the California Achievement Reading test, as she thought she wasn't working up to her potential. The result of her total reading was 1.6, so we decided to give her remedial reading.... The first of February, Debbie had seemed to progress so much we decided to give her the California Achievement Reading Test again (different form). Her total reading score was recorded at 3.6--a gain of 2 years in 3 1/2 months. Her classroom teacher and principal say that remedial reading provided the spark or boost that Debbie needed. Her enthusiasm and confidence remained at the end of the year....

Different Views on the Importance of Money

A recent Ford Foundation study, A Foundation Goes to School, looked at 25 educational experiments funded with $30 million of the foundation's money. The study concluded that the "size of the grant seemed to have little to do with ultimate success." The study noted that general, broad-purpose grants were less successful than those grants with limited goals and specific purposes.

A review of the "success stories" listed on the previous pages of this chapter indicates that many of them had per-pupil costs in excess of $300. This figure has been suggested by the Nixon Administration and others as the necessary level for successful compensatory education intervention.

A December 1971 study by the Rand Corp., How Effective Is Schooling?, was submitted to the President's Commission on School Finance. In its summary of findings on compensatory education evaluation and finance, it drew the following conclusions:

- Virtually without exception, all of the large surveys of the large national compensatory education programs have shown no beneficial results on average. However, the evaluation reports on which the surveys are based are often poor and their research designs suspect.

- A number of intervention programs have been designed quite carefully and display gains in pupil cognitive performance, again in the short run. In particular, pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds tend to show greater progress in more highly structured programs.

- It would appear that per-pupil costs of successful educational intervention vary anywhere from $200 on up, with the feasible range for such programs falling between $250 and $350. However, numerous interventions funded at these levels have failed. Clearly, the level of funding is not itself a sufficient condition for success.

The HEW Urban Education Task Force, which reviewed the urban school crisis (and touched on other aspects of education), proposed in late 1969 a per-pupil cost of $500 for compensatory education programs. The task force compared the costs of operational grants for cities of more than 100,000 population by using the $500 per-pupil and $300 per-pupil figures under its proposed Urban Education Act; at the $300 per-pupil figure, the operation grants would be $3.492 billion; at $500 per pupil, $5.82 billion.

The NACEDC has never been specific about per-pupil expenditures and costs, but it has always endorsed full funding of compensatory education programs. However, NACEDC does recommend that states also contribute funds to improve the education of educationally deprived children.

CRYSTAL-BALL GAZING

Predicting the course and direction of federal compensatory efforts is somewhat akin to predicting the weather in Washington, D.C., on any given day. Although the comparison may appear absurd, many observers of the federal scene say compensatory education, like the weather, is here to stay. But changes are on the horizon.

Parts of three major bills (the Perkins bill, HR 69; the Quie bill, HR 5163; and the Administration's Better Schools Act, HR 5823) were incorporated into the bill released by the House General Education Subcommittee extending ESEA. The bill was on its way in September 1973 (as this report went to press) to the full Education and Labor Committee, where additional amendments may and probably will be made. The major bill in the Senate is the Pell bill, S 1539. Differences will then be ironed out between the two Houses of Congress.

The following provisions contained in the subcommittee bill indicate some of the changes that are being considered for the revamping of Title I and the consolidation of some other federal programs. None of the changes will be implemented until both houses agree; therefore the provisions below should serve as an "alert" only.

- ESEA would be extended for five years.
- Title I formula: Based on a proposal by Rep. Albert Quie, R-Minn., the formula provides that Title I funds would be distributed to states according to the number of children counted in the 1970 census from families with annual incomes below $3,000 plus children from higher income families who receive Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) benefits. AFDC children will be weighted, however, to count only two-thirds as much as the children included in the low-income count.
- Payment rate: The Title I payment rate would be cut from the current 50% of the state or national average per-pupil expenditure (whichever is higher) to 40%. The state average could not exceed the national average by more than 120%.
- Hold harmless: This part of the amendment would allow the local education agency to receive at least 85% of its Title I-Part A allotment of the previous year.
- Distribution based on achievement: In a move away from directing states to distribute funds to local education agencies on the basis of the poverty criteria, the subcommittee bill would allow the local edu-

cation agency, starting in 1974, to decide whether it wanted to distribute funds within the local education agency on the basis of the poverty standard, achievement data (based on a testing program), or both. In 1975, the state would be given the option of distributing funds to local education agencies on the basis of the poverty standard, achievement data (based on a testing program) or a combination of both.

- Establishment of National Commission: The Quie amendment would establish a 15-member national commission on educational disadvantage to study the use of testing for determining the number and distribution of disadvantaged children in the United States and to study whether Title I funds might be allocated on that basis.

Included in the bill was a grant consolidation proposal offered by Rep. Alphonzo Bell, R-Calif. Under the proposal, two categories would be created: (1) support and (2) innovation.

Under the support package, the following would be combined: Title II, ESEA (libraries); Title III, NDEA (equipment and remodeling); Title V, ESEA (strengthening state departments); and the guidance and counseling section of Title III, ESEA.

The innovation category would combine Title III, ESEA (except for guidance and counseling; environmental education; Title VIII, ESEA (school nutrition and health section); and Title VII, ESEA (dropout prevention). States would receive 100% of the appropriation.

An amendment by Rep. Carl D. Perkins, D-Ky., would provide that the consolidation would not become effective unless the appropriation for the consolidated programs is at least equal to the amount appropriated for the separate programs in the previous fiscal year. Another Perkins amendment would allow local education agencies to submit a single application to the state department of education. States would be required to set forth specific criteria they would use in distributing funds.

Another hint of what Congress wants in conjunction with the distribution of federal funds was given in an amendment by Rep. Shirley Chisholm, D-N.Y. Her amendment wsuld require each local education agency to report expenditures of all federal funds to USOE within 30 days after the close of the fiscal year in which they were spent. The data would also have to be submitted ts Congress within a specified number of days.

There are many other changes that could be made in addition to or in place of those outlined above. The questions of how much money and how it is to be spent have occupied many congressmen and educators and others testifying before subcommittees. The Administration wants even more consolidation. And the question of who should have how much authority over any part of a compensatory education program is frequently bantered about.

The only sure thing: aid to the disadvantaged will be given high priority by the federal government for years to come. The problem is far too serious to be neglected or ignored.

APPENDIX
1973 Ed Fair Programs

Title I

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM (Contact: Douglas Hupp, Project Director, 1847 N. Chautauqua St., Wichita, Kan. 67214)
Students served: grades 1-9. Aim: To improve word recognition and reading comprehension. Method: Instructional group size and number of weekly sessions based on student's needs. Use of controlled readers, filmstrip projectors, record players, cassette and reel recorders, overhead projectors.

CRITERION READING INSTRUCTION PROJECT (Contact: Ms. Anita Schmidt, Project Director, Linden Public Schools, Linden, N.J. 07036)
Students Served: kindergarten and grade 1. Aim: To develop reading skills through individualized approach. Method: Test-teach-test method; small group and individual instruction; daily progress records; monthly reports for classroom teacher and parents; 150 minutes of special instruction weekly.

KINDERGARTEN, AN OPEN DOOR TO LEARNING (Contact: Ms. Bonnie Nicholson, Project Director, Bessemer City Schools, 412 N. 17th St., Bessemer, Ala. 35020)
Students served: kindergarten. Aim: To prepare preschoolers for first grade. Method: Providing opportunities for problem solving; stress on intellectual development; parent involvement encouraged.

READING/ENGLISH ROTATION PROJECT (Contact: Roy J. Yelton, Project Director, Norris Junior High, McDuffie County Schools, Thomson, Ga. 30823)
Students served: grades 7-9. Aim: To develop basic reading and English skills. Method: 20 students move through three classrooms for 110-minute classes; ongoing evaluation and restructuring of teaching activities daily.

PROGRAM FOR READING DEVELOPMENT (Contact: Mrs. Audrey W. Brune, Project Director, Roosevelt High School, 6941 N. Central St., Portland, Ore. 97203)
Students served: grades 9-11. Aim: To raise students' reading ability to grade level (students ordinarily read five years below grade). Method: Emphasis is on phonics; use of dictation, spelling; oral reading; parent involvement.

PROJECT CATCHUP (Contact: Mrs. Fay Harbison, Project Director, 1601 16th St., Newport Beach, Calif. 92660)
Students served: K-8 (bilingual underachievers). Aim: To increase reading skills by 1.5 months for each month in program and to increase arithmetic skills by 1 month for each month in program. Method: Individualized instruction; inservice training for staff in individual diagnosis, reading and math instruction. Language program uses high interest reading materials.

PUPILS ADVANCING IN LEARNING (Contact: Mrs. Linda Jones, Project Director, Adams 12-Thornton-Northglenn, 10280 N. Huron St., Denver, Colo. 80221)
Students served: grades 7-9 students with severe reading deficiencies. Aim: To improve reading ability and attitude toward reading. Method: Emphasis on word recognition, vocabulary development, comprehension and study skills; students encouraged to verbalize their experiences; students diagnose their problems and make their own choices for future learning.

REMEDIAL READING (Contact: Don Clark, Project Director, Flagstaff Elementary School District, 701 N. Kendrick, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001)
Students served: grades 2-12. Aim: To improve reading achievement of stu-

dents through placement in remedial classes. Method: Individual reading; amount of remediation based on needs; parent/community involvement.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM (Contact: William J. Higgins Jr., Project Director, Newport Public Schools, Mumford School Annex, Newport, R.I. 02840)
Students served: grades 2-3; 6-8. Aim: To increase vocabulary/reading comprehension; to decrease absenteeism. Method: Individualized program; 30-minute daily supplementary treatment; parent involvement in evaluation.

FIRST CALCULATING AND READING QUEST (Contact: Steve Graff, Project Director, Loneman Day School, Oglala, S.D. 57764)
Students served: students scoring one or more years below national norms in reading and math. Aim: To raise reading and math levels by 1.5 years. Method: Instruction in native language (Lakota); early diagnostic testing; individualized daily tutorial program in reading lab.

Follow Through

FOLLOW THROUGH (Contact: Blain E. Martin, Director of Follow Through, New Madrid County R #1 School District, Portageville, Mo. 63873)
Students Served: grades K-3. Aim: To enrich school and home environment. Method: Concentration on basic skills; pacing materials to student's ability; training parents to work in classroom and use behavior techniques.

Title VII

BILINGUAL MINI HEADSTART PROJECT (Contact: Mrs. Louise Gustafson, Intermediate School District #103, 1600 N. Chase Ave., P.O. Box 2367, Pasco, Wash. 99302)
Students served: 3- to 5-year-old children of migrant farm workers. Aim: To train migrant parents and adults to function as paraprofessionals and to help children attain 100 days of continuous attendance. Method: paraprofessionals trained to use high verbal interaction with children.

Title III

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROJECT (Contact: Ms. Helen Hanson, Dale Avenue School, 21 Dale Ave., Paterson, N.J. 07505)
Students served: prekindergarten-3. Aim: To provide a demonstration center of urban programs/techniques. Method: Ungraded; identification of student's disability; development of evaluation techniques; parent involvement.

EARLY PREVENTION OF SCHOOL FAILURE (Contact: Mrs. Luceille Werner, 114 N. 2nd St., Peotone, Ill. 60468)
Students served: kindergarten. Aim: To identify students with learning disabilities and improve academic performance. Method: Placement in learning disability kindergarten; referral and assessment services; speech correction classes; use of special teachers and social workers when needed.

LEARNING EXPERIENCE MODULE (Contact: Mrs. Elanor Russo, Fanny M. Hillers Schools, Longview Ave., Hackensack, N.J. 07601)
Aim: To meet academic needs with individualized learning. Method: Using existing facilities to accommodate more students without increasing costs or lowering educational level; focus on behavioral change.

MODIFICATION OF CHILDREN'S ORAL LANGUAGE (Contact: James D. Bryden, Dept. of Communication Disorders, Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pa. 17815)
Students served: special education classes at all levels. Aim: To train teachers and clinicians in use of language program. Method: Combining modern linguistic concepts with behavioral technology.

OCCUPATIONAL VERSATILITY (Contact: John Ladender, Highline School District #401, 15765 Ambaum Blvd. SW, Seattle, Wash. 98166)
Students served: grades 6-9. Aim: To enable boys and girls to function in industrial arts. Method: Team teaching; self-instruction; student-managed.

PEAGUS (Contact: Mrs. Marie Sinclair, Tuscaloosa City Schools, 1100-21st St. E., Tuscaloosa, Ala. 35401)
Students served: grades 1-6. Aim: To increase reading achievement. Method: Personalized, process-oriented program; differentiated staffing; staff-developed materials; use of individualized learning prescriptions.

PROJECT ADVENTURE (Contact: Robert R. Lentz, 775 Ray Rd., Hamilton, Mass. 01936)
Aim: To encourage new look at environmental education by students and staff. Method: Use of outdoor learning environments; community involvement.

PROJECT LEARNING DISABILITIES (Contact: Ms. Nancy Hoepffner, 1515 S. Salcedo St., New Orleans, La. 70125)
Students served: kindergarten and up. Aim: To identify learning disability students; provide remediation. Method: Individualized instructional prescriptions; parent involvement; providing needed support services.

PROJECT STAY (Contact: Tom Butler, 400 N. Broadway, Moore Schools, Moore, Okla. 73060)
Students served: potential dropouts. Aim: Very early identification of potential dropouts. Method: Counseling and individualized academic program.

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT (Contact: Marion Thompson, 210 Pryor St. SW, Atlanta, Ga. 30303)
Students served: grades 1-8 (inner city). Aim: To successfully use behavior modification techniques. Method: Training teachers to use techniques and tokens.

PROJECT SUCCESS FOR SPECIFIC LANGUAGE DISABILITIES (Contact: Richart Metteer, Wayne Public Schools, District #17, 611 W. 7th St., Wayne, Neb. 68787)
Students served: grades 1-4. Aim: To prevent failure for children with specific language disability. Method: Use of multisensory structural linguistic language program; motor perception training; curriculum modification.

REEDUCATION FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN (Contact: Donald R. Alwes, Jefferson County Board of Education, 3332 Newburg Rd., Louisville, Ky. 40218)
Students served: ages 6-12. Aim: To prepare children to function in regular classrooms. Method: Evaluation/diagnosis/reeducation in residential school or day care classes until return to regular classes; two-year follow-up; parent involvement.

SYSTEMS APPROACH TO INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION (Contact: W. Dale Fallow, 310 San Francisco St., Grants Pass, Ore. 97526)
Students served: ages 5-13. Aim: To help children reach established behavioral objectives. Method: Development and use of learning packages.

Title I State Coordinators

Current as of July 23, 1973

ALABAMA
Edward Spear, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg., Rm. 460
Montgomery, Ala. 36104
205: 269-7357

ALASKA
Kenneth Crieser, Coordinator
Federal Programs
State Dept. of Education
326 Alaska Office Bldg.
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: 8-206-442-0150
ask for Juneau 586-5366

ARIZONA
Lawrence P. Lemons, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
1688 W. Adams St.
Phoenix, Ariz. 85007
602: 271-5235

ARKANSAS
C. E. Morris, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Arch Ford Education Bldg.
Little Rock, Ark. 72201
501: 371-1803

CALIFORNIA
Manuel Ceja, Director
Division of Compensatory Education
State Dept. of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. 95814
916: 445-2590

COLORADO
Victor Wall, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg.
Denver, Colo. 80203
303: 892-2234

CONNECTICUT
Jerry Barbaiesi, Chief
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
State Dept. of Education
165 Capitol Ave., Rm. 360
Hartford, Conn. 06115
203: 566-2117

DELAWARE
William Corkle, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Public Instruction
PO Box 697
Dover, Del. 19901
302: 678-4667

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Mrs. Francis Watts
Coordinator, Title I, ESEA
1411 K St. NW, Rm. 1400
Washington, D.C. 20004
202: 737-2557

FLORIDA
Halley B. Lewis Jr.
Coordinator, Title I, ESEA
Dept. of Education
219 W. Jefferson St.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32304
904: 599-5151

GEORGIA
Billy Tidwell, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg., Rm. 316
Atlanta, Ga. 30334
404: 656-2436

HAWAII
John Uchima, Administrator
Compensatory Education
State Dept. of Education
PO Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
Phone: 8-415-556-0220 ask for Honolulu telephone number: 415-548-2211

IDAHO
D. L. Hicks
Program Administrator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Idaho State Office Bldg.
Boise, Idaho 83707
208: 384-2195

ILLINOIS
Robert H. Hardy Jr.
Director, Title I, ESEA
Office of the Supt. of Public Instruction
1020 S. Spring
Springfield, Ill. 62706
217: 525-6036

INDIANA
Meredith V. Poer, Director
Federal Projects Division
State Dept. of Public Instruction
803 State Office Bldg.
100 Senate Ave.
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204
317: 633-4436

IOWA
Oliver T. Himley, Chief
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Grimes Office Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
515: 281-5313

KANSAS
Kenneth Gentry, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Kansas State Education Bldg.
120 E. 10th St.
Topeka, Kan. 66612
913: 296-3161

KENTUCKY
John Bruce, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Frankfort, Ky. 40601
502: 564-3301

LOUISIANA
Charles Jarreau, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Baton Rouge, La. 70804
504: 389-5291

MAINE
James Morrison
Acting Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Education Bldg.
Augusta, Maine 04330
207: 289-3541

MARYLAND
Percy Williams, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
PO Box 8717
Friendship International Airport
Baltimore, Md. 21240
301: 796-8300 Ext. 230

MASSACHUSETTS
Robert Jeffery, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
182 Tremont St.
Boston, Mass. 02111
617: 727-5745

MICHIGAN
Kenneth Swanson, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Box 420
Lansing, Mich. 48902
517: 373-3666

MINNESOTA
Jack Hanson, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
Dept. of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar St.
St. Paul, Minn. 55101
612: 296-2181

MISSISSIPPI
A. J. Comfort, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
PO Box 771
Jackson, Miss. 39205
601: 354-6944

MISSOURI
Otis Baker, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
PO Box 480
Jefferson City, Mo. 65101
314: 389-2643

MONTANA
Dean Lindahl, Supervisor
Title I, ESEA
Office of the State Supt. of Public Instruction
Helena, Mont. 59301
406: 449-2410

NEBRASKA
Larry Vontz, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
233 S. 10th
Lincoln, Neb. 68509
402: 471-2481

NEVADA
James Costa, Director
Federal Relations
State Dept. of Education
Carson City, Nev. 89701
702: 882-7161

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Richard Hodges, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
Division of Instruction
State Dept. of Education
64 N. Main St.
Concord, N.H. 03301
603: 271-2717

NEW JERSEY
Jerome B. Jones, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
225 W. State St.
Trenton, N.J. 08625
609: 292-5413

NEW MEXICO
Jacob D. Martinez, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education Bldg.
Santa Fe, N.M. 87501
505: 827-5267

NEW YORK
Louis Pasquini, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Education Dept.
Room 367
Albany, N.Y. 12224
518: 474-1112

NORTH CAROLINA
Harold H. Webb
Special Assistant for Compensatory Education
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C. 27602
919: 829-7665

NORTH DAKOTA
Warren Pederson, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Public Instruction
State Capitol Bldg.
Bismarck, N.D. 58501
701: 224-2282

OHIO
Arlie E. Cox, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
933 High St.
Worthington, Ohio 43085
614: 469-4161

OKLAHOMA
Ray Willingham, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Oklahoma City, Okla. 73105
405: 478-1374

OREGON
Dale Skewis, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Board of Education
Salem, Ore. 97310
503: 378-3606

PENNSYLVANIA
John Hyams, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126
717: 787-7136; 7137

RHODE ISLAND
Gerry W. Leonard, Coordinator
Grant Programs (Compensatory Education)
State Dept. of Education
Roger Williams Bldg.
Hayes St.
Providence, R.I. 02908
401: 277-2681

SOUTH CAROLINA
Jack Seurynck, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Rutledge Bldg., Rm. 201
Columbia, S.C. 29201
803: 758-3471

SOUTH DAKOTA
Lyndon M. Loken, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Pierre, S.D. 57501
605: 224-3218; 3219

TENNESSEE
Willis Nowell, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
221 Cordell Hull Bldg.
Nashville, Tenn. 37219
615: 741-3433; 3434

TEXAS
R. E. Slayton, Director
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th St.
Austin, Tex. 78701
512: 475-4126

UTAH
Kerry Nelson
Acting Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
Office of the Supt. of Public Instruction
136 E. South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
801: 328-5061

VERMONT
Gerald Asseline, Chief
Special Projects
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
State Office Bldg.
Montpelier, Vt. 05602
802: 828-3124 Ext. 515

VIRGINIA
Robert W. Sparks, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Board of Education
Richmond, Va. 23216
804: 770-3179

WASHINGTON
Milo Long, Supervisor
Grants Management
Title I Contact, Supt. of Public Instruction
Olympia, Wash. 98501
206: 753-2562

WEST VIRGINIA
David Purdy
Assistant Director of Federal Programs
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
State Capitol Bldg., Rm. W-217
Charleston, W.Va. 25305
304: 348-2701

WISCONSIN
Frank N. Brown, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Public Instruction
126 Langdon St.
Madison, Wis. 53703
608: 266-2699

WYOMING
Frank Supon, Director
Title I, ESEA
State Dept. of Education
Cheyenne, Wyo. 82001
307: 777-7343

AMERICAN SAMOA
Robert J. Moran, Coordinator
Title I, ESEA
Dept. of Education
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96920

GUAM
Thomas S. N. Barcinas
Acting Administrator
Federal Programs
Dept. of Education
PO Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910

PUERTO RICO
Maria de Jesus, Coordinator
External Resources
Dept. of Education
Hato Rey, P.R. 00900
106-809-766-1096

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
Harold Crouch
Federal Programs Officer
Dept. of Education
Office of the High Commissioner
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950

VIRGIN ISLANDS
Cecil A. George, Coordinator
Federal Programs
Dept. of Education
St. Thomas, V.I. 00801
809: 774-0100 Ext. 251

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
John Trace
Title I Chief
Bureau of Indian Affairs
PO Box 1788
Albuquerque, N.M. 87103
505: 843-2652; 53; 54

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
Frank J. Monahan
Assistant Director for Governmental Programs
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
United States Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
202: 659-6652

NACEDC Recommendations for Legislation on Compensatory Education

NACEDC made the following recommendations to Congress in August 1973 as necessary components in any "good" compensatory education effort. The recommendations were condensed by NACEDC from those it made to the President in its 1973 Annual Report. Although NACEDC Chairman Alfred McElroy presented the recommendations as the council's views on the Administration-backed Better Schools Act, he said they should be used to evaluate any of the pending congressional alternatives to ESEA.

NACEDC recommends that any compensatory education effort contain:

- A comparability of services requirement to ensure that local moneys are not supplanted by federal funds.
- Districtwide parent advisory councils to ensure local accountability to the parents of the children to be served.
- Public information access in order to provide appropriate data to the public to properly evaluate the success of the program, so long as individual student privacy is respected with regard to specific information.
- A nonpublic school bypass to provide relief in cases where the assistant secretary determines that a district has failed to provide comparable services to children enrolled in the private schools, or where state laws prohibit such services.
- Migrant program guarantees to provide the nearly 500,000 migrant children equal educational opportunity through maximum use of the Uniform Migrant Record Transfer System.
- Enforcement procedures to provide services to children when there is a breakdown in the state-federal delivery system and to provide compensation to the federal government for misspent funds.
- Fiscal audits and maintenance of effort to monitor the accurate expenditure of funds according to the law, and to insure the supplementing, and not supplanting, of local funds with federal resources.
- Concentration of funds to maximize the use of the limited dollars available so that significant gains in performance of the children are noted.
- Maintenance of local initiative to develop programs which meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children, as long as parents of affected children have been actively involved in the needs assessment and the operation and evaluation of the program.
- Desegregation guidelines so that school districts which are engaged in the administration of desegregation plans can serve the participating children without unnecessary resegregation.
- Program reviews which provide technical assistance and expertise to the local administrators and states, while ensuring that audits properly reflect legislated intent.

1973 Recommendations from Title III Advisory Council

I. The title of Title III, ESEA, be changed to read: "Title III--Innovation in Education."

II. The words "supplementary centers and services" be deleted wherever they occur in the legislation. The words "stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality" be deleted from Sec. 301 (a). The words "to assist the states in establishing and maintaining programs of testing and guidance and counseling" be deleted from Sec. 301 (a).

III. Title III, ESEA, be extended for five years as a specific federal program to provide funds to the states to be used by them to stimulate creation of innovative educational programs to meet identified educational needs.

IV. Funding authorizations and appropriations for Title III more nearly reflect the national need for model educational programs.

V. The words "funds may be used for the same purposes and the funding of the same types of programs previously authorized" be deleted from Sec. 303 (3) and the words "programs for testing students in the public and private elementary and secondary schools and in junior colleges and technical institutes in the state" be deleted from Sec. 303 (b)(4).

VI. Positive action be taken by USOE to encourage participation of nonpublic school children and teachers in all Title III projects in which they are eligible to participate, and that the right of nonpublic schools to apply for Title III funds through the appropriate local education agency be protected by the states and USOE.

VII. USOE, in cooperation with the ESEA Title III State Coordinators, review present policies regarding state plans and develop procedures for the annual submission of a modified document.

VIII. USOE adopt the practice of responding in writing to recommendations of state education agencies made in annual reports and develop an annual statement that reflects the status of ESEA Title III.

IX. The U.S. Congress take the necessary action to insure that Section 306 of Title III is administered in compliance with the intent of the legislation, or steps be taken to delete that section from the legislation.

X. The State Plans Section (85%) and the Special Programs and Projects Section (15%) of Title III be administered by USOE within a single administrative unit.

XI. The U.S. Comr. of Education use a portion of the Title III Section 306 funds which are discretionary to the commissioner to provide funding to limited numbers of Title III projects which have developed successful programs and practices under operational Title III grants, to enable the projects to continue operation as models for potential adopters for one or two years after the expiration of their original federal funding.

Education U.S.A. Special Reports

Discipline Crisis in Schools: The Problem, Causes and the Search for Solutions. Mounting problems in handling disruptive behavior have touched off debate over who's to blame, strictness vs. permissiveness, the use of corporal punishment, the effect of court decisions on student rights. Blueprints for handling the problem. 1973, 64 pp., #411-13445. $4.75 each.

School Volunteers: Districts Recruit Aides To Meet Rising Costs, Student Needs. Benefits and drawbacks. How to start a program. How to recruit, train and utilize volunteers. Lists of proven activities. Studies of successful programs. 1973, 64 pp., #411-13443. $4.75.

School Lunch Breakthrough: Politics, Technology Spur Expansion of Food Programs. Details on new food delivery systems and new food technology enabling schools to feed more hungry children. Controversy between Congress and the Dept. of Agriculture. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13441. $4.75.

Informal Education: 'Open Classroom' Provokes Change, Controversy. How informal education differs from traditional education. How effective it is. Theories of child development from which it grew. Many varieties. 1972, 60 pp., #411-13439. $4.75.

Alternative Schools: Pioneering Districts Create Options for Students. The wide variety of alternatives offered, their achievements, problems, pitfalls. How they are financed. Steps toward starting one. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13437. $4.75.

IGE: Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit School. Describes a new form of school organization under which an elementary, middle or high school can incorporate all kinds of innovative methods and strategies. How it works. 1972, 56 pp., #411-13435. $4.75.

Dropouts: Prevention and Rehabilitation—Schools Rescue Potential Failures. Focuses on adaptable programs which appear to be yielding results. 1972, 56 pp., #411-13433. $4.75.

Performance Contracting in Schools: Profit Motive Tested As Incentive to Learning. Different types of contracts. Testing. Texarkana project. Banneker Elementary School project. New terminology. Opinion of public, parents, students, boards. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13431. $4.75.

Schoolgirl Pregnancy: Old Problem; New Solutions. Court decisions. Rulings by state education departments. Refutations of old arguments. Pros and cons of regular vs. special classes. Sample school policies. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13429. $4.75.

Student Rights and Responsibilities: Courts Force Schools To Change. What rights students have under the Constitution. Recent court decisions. How schools also stress student responsibilities. Sample local policies. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13427. $4.75.

PPBS and the School: New System Promotes Efficiency, Accountability. Pros and cons of PPBS, a management tool to plan and manage a school district's activities and resources. Specific examples. 1972, 56 pp., #411-13425. $4.75.

Paraprofessionals in Schools: How New Careerists Bolster Education. How paraprofessionals are helping to increase student achievement and free teachers to teach. What they do on the job. How to recruit, train, supervise them. 1972, 64 pp., #411-13423. $4.75.

Year-Round School: Districts Develop Successful Programs. Definitions, advantages and disadvantages, comparative cost figures, and capsule reviews of 20 districts operating a year-round program. Comprehensive case studies. 1971, 64 pp., #411-13421. $4.75.

Shared Services and Cooperatives: Schools Combine Resources to Improve Education. How the rural school district or city system can share such services as special education, enrichment programs, counseling. 1971, 60 pp., #411-13419. $4.75.

Drug Crisis: Schools Fight Back with Innovative Programs. The problem in perspective. Specifics of what is essential for a successful school drug abuse program. 1971, 64 pp., #411-13417. $4.75.

Vandalism and Violence: Innovative Strategies Reduce Cost to Schools. Measures school systems are taking to achieve security, deter crime, handle bomb threats. Roles of security personnel. How to involve students and community in preventive programs. 1971, 56 pp., #411-13415. $4.75.

Individualization in Schools: The Challenge and the Options. How eight major individualization systems are providing individualized instruction to thousands of students in reading, math, science and social studies. 1971, 64 pp., #411-13413. $4.75.

Environment and the Schools. Programs in states, school districts, colleges and universities. Philosophy and objectives of a good environmental education program. 1971, 56 pp., #411-13411. $4.75.

Vocational Education: Innovations Revolutionize Career Training. Successful career training programs in elementary and secondary schools. Unique developments and innovative programs. 1971, 64 pp., #411-13409. $4.75.

Preschool Breakthrough: What Works in Early Childhood Education. Review of new philosophies and old controversies. Some research results. A guide to the federal apparatus. Detailed descriptions of projects increasing achievement of young children. 1970, 48 pp., #411-13407. $4.75.

Reading Crisis: The Problem and Suggested Solutions. A roundup of the most recent discoveries on reading problems and a guide to supervisory and teaching techniques. 1970, 56 pp., #411-13405. $4.75.

Differentiated Staffing in Schools. Strengths, weaknesses and pitfalls of differentiated staffing. Facts and opinions on this revolutionary and controversial method of staff organization. 1970, 48 pp., #411-13403. $4.75.

Address communications and make checks payable to the National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209.